DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 105 HE 013 573

TITLE Maryland Statewide Plan for Postsecondary Education. Second Annual Review.
INSTITUTION Maryland State Board for Higher Education, Annapolis.
PUB DATE Sep 80
NOTE 131p.; Adopted September, 1980, by the State Board for Higher Education.
AVAILABLE FROM State Board for Higher Education, 16 Francis Street, Annapolis, MD 21401.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; College Administration; College Faculty; College Libraries; *College Planning; College Programs; College Role; Community Colleges; *Educational Facilities Planning; Educational Finance; Educational Policy; Enrollment Projections; *Enrollment Trends; Financial Support; Graduate Study; *Higher Education; *Master Plans; Postsecondary Education; Predictor Variables; State Universities; *Statewide Planning; Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS *Maryland; University of Maryland

ABSTRACT

The second annual status report on the implementation of the Maryland statewide plan for postsecondary education and on additional issues for action is presented. The following areas are considered: enrollments; programs; finance; facilities; faculty, libraries, and computer services; implementation of role and mission actions; and new planning initiatives. The new planning initiatives concern higher education in the greater Baltimore metropolitan area, financing community colleges, administrative salaries at public four-year institutions, and financial auxiliary enterprise facilities. The plan identifies general segmental and institutional missions for public institutions. Indicators that define various components of institutional mission, such as predictive indices for admission and attrition, are assessed, and five-year plans for academic program development are included to further delineate campus missions. Information about missions, enrollments, programs, and the other areas is provided for individual colleges. Among the program concerns are the following: increasing access to part-time and evening graduate programs at the University of Maryland, providing programs to meet the needs of students on federal installations, providing programs designed to attract high ability students, and procedures and stipulations for developing new programs. Additional areas that are addressed include: private support and federal financial aid programs, faculty and administrative salaries, analysis of program costs, and facilities management. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED200105

SECOND ANNUAL REVIEW

MARYLAND STATEWIDE PLAN FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

md State Bd of H. E.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Adopted September, 1980
by the
State Board for Higher Education

HE013 573

The Maryland State Board for Higher Education is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer.

State of Maryland

STATE BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Harry K. Wells, Chairman

Richard R. Kline, Vice Chairman

Thelma B. Cox, Secretary

J. Harrison Ager

Gertrude H. Crist

Steny H. Hoyer

Lucy Keker

Thomas H. Maddux

Hon. Mary L. Nock

Philip Pear

Oakley Saunders, M.D.

Dr. Sheldon H. Knorr

Commissioner of Higher Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	NEW PLANNING INITIATIVES	3
III.	IMPLEMENTATION OF ROLE AND MISSION ACTIONS	9
IV.	ENROLLMENTS	51
V.	PROGRAMS	67
VI.	FINANCE	97
VII.	FACILITIES	115
VIII.	FACULTY, LIBRARIES, AND COMPUTER SERVICES	123

I. Introduction

The Maryland Statewide Plan for Postsecondary Education was adopted in July, 1978. Title 12, Section III of the Maryland Annotated Code requires that this Plan be reviewed annually. The First Annual Review was published in October 1979. That document provided an assessment of the degree to which the recommendations of Plan had been implemented and identified selected additional issues for action. This report constitutes the second annual status report on the implementation of the Plan and on the additional issues identified in the First Annual Review.

II. New Planning Initiatives

Four new areas were identified for action in the First Annual Review. The status of each of these to date is summarized in this chapter.

Higher Education in the Greater Baltimore Metropolitan Area

The First Annual Review of the Statewide Plan provided for the SBHE to study and develop recommendations concerning public higher education in the Baltimore area. This initiative was the result of concern about the increasing competition for students among Baltimore area institutions, the poorer than average undergraduate enrollment prospects in that region, and mission similarities among public four-year institutions. Previously, higher education in the Baltimore area had been studied by the Maryland Council for Higher Education in 1969 and 1974.

On December 6, 1979 the SBHE held a hearing in Annapolis during which members of the higher education community presented their views on the issue. Following this hearing, the Board asked the Commissioner to carry out an analysis of the enrollment, finance, and facilities implications of various courses of action. At a special meeting of the Board on December 19 the staff reviewed for the Board a variety of projections. The Commissioner indicated that there was not a strong case for closing an institution at the present time. The Board asked that the Commissioner submit to them his recommendations on the subject.

On December 20 the Commissioner sent to the Board the following set of recommendations:

1) Enrollment limitations for new full-time freshmen be placed on all public four-year institutions in order to make them more selective and in order to ensure an equitable distribution of students among institutions;

2) Each public four-year institution develop a unique identity;

3) Morgan State University, UMBC, and the University of Baltimore be combined under the governance of the Board of Regents of the University of Maryland; and,

4) Indicators be developed to monitor the academic and financial viability of public four-year institutions.

On February 13, the Board held a public hearing in Baltimore on the Commissioner's recommendations. In light of the strong opposition voiced to the plan at that hearing, the Board, at its March 1980 meeting, rejected the consolidation of the three institutions and approved the following three actions:

1) That specific five-year program plans for each public four-year institution be designated in the 1980 update of the Statewide Plan which will provide for program development at each institution that is not unnecessarily duplicative of programs in other institutions;

2) That an enrollment plan for each public four-year institution be developed which places a limit on full-time freshman;

3) That each public four-year institution provide an annual audited statement of its financial condition.

The action to date on the program plans is included in Chapter III. Action on enrollments is summarized in Chapter IV.

FINANCING COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The SBHE and SBCC conducted a study on financing community colleges which was presented to the Governor. The study recommended that the State pay 70 percent of the General Funds expended per FTES at the four-year public institutions for the first 500 FTES at each community college and 40 percent of the General Funds expended per FTES at the four-year public institutions for all remaining FTES at each community college. Thus, the proposed formula would have related funding of Community Colleges to State funding of the public four-year institutions. The Governor chose to add $50 per FTES to the current formula for FY 1981 and referred the question of community college funding to the State-Local Fiscal Relations Task Force for a recommendation.

ADMINISTRATIVE SALARIES AT PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

One responsibility assigned to the SBHE by law is the establishment of "...general guidelines for faculty and administrative salaries for consideration by the governing boards of the institutions." The Plan recommends that faculty and administrative salaries be maintained at levels which are competitive with those at comparable institutions.

In accordance with the SBHE's statutory responsibilities, the SBHE in consultation with the Finance Advisory Committee and

representatives of the Department of Personnel initiated an assessment of: (1) salary levels among higher education administrators in Maryland in comparison to salary levels for similar jobs at similar institutions and agencies throughout the country; and (2) salary policies currently governing higher education administrators. The study deals with administrators at the University of Maryland, the State Universities and Colleges and their Board of Trustees, Morgan State University, St. Mary's College, the Maryland Higher Education Loan Corporation (MHELC), the State Board for Community Colleges (SBCC), the State Board for Higher Education (SBHE) and the State Scholarship Board (SSB).

During the Fall, 1979, the State Board for Higher Education staff conducted a survey in order to assess the competitiveness of administrative salaries in higher education in Maryland with those paid by similar institutions and agencies throughout the country. A comparison of the average salaries at the Maryland institutions and the sample of peer institutions indicates that the overall salaries of each of Maryland's segments of higher education, except Morgan State University, are below those of their competitors.

	Maryland	Selected Peers	Difference Above/(Below) Peers Amount	Percent
Univ. of Md.	$34,368	$39,051	$(4,683)	(12.0)
St. Univ. and Coll.	25,043	30,084	(5,041)	(16.8)
Morgan St. Univ.	27,616	27,135	481	1.8
St. Mary's	22,171	26,793	(4,622)	(17.2)
SBCC	30,638	36,605	(5,967)	(16.3)
SSB	26,436	36,531	(10,095)	(27.6)
MHELC	23,706	34,219	(10,513)	(30.7)
SBHE	27,957	31,646	(3,690)	(11.7)

The Finance Advisory Committee determined that there are several different salary policies in existence for higher education administrators. These policies are administered by three different State agencies. This situation has resulted in a lack of consistent coordination and direction in attracting and retaining the most qualified administrators.

The SBHE staff, working with the Finance Advisory Committee, is in the final stages of developing Administrative Salary guidelines which will: (1) provide a method for determining administrative salary levels that are competitive with comparable jobs at similar institutions of higher education as well as at private and public agencies; (2) establish

policies and mechanisms that provide for competitive salaries and for institutional and agency flexibility in determining individual salary levels; and (3) provide for an on-going review and evaluation process at the Satewide level to monitor the results of the first two steps and provide Statewide coordination of Higher Education Administrative Salaries.

The salary guidelines for Executives and Senior Administrators in Maryland Public Higher Education will be presented to the SBHE in Fall, 1980 for adoption. Following this, a review of faculty salaries will be undertaken.

FINANCING AUXILIARY ENTERPRISE FACILITIES

The First Annual Review provided that the SBHE study alternative methods for the capital funding of student dormitories, unions, and dining halls at public four-year institutions of higher education.

The twelve public four-year institutions of higher education in Maryland currently have a total of 17,056 dormitory beds available for occupancy. The State paid $37.9 million, or 55.7 percent, of their $68.0 million construction cost. All of the public four-year institutions either have a permanent student union or have devoted some space temporarily to limited student union activities. The construction of permanent student unions cost $25.0 million of which the State paid $4.3 million, or 17.1 percent. There are 11 dining halls at the four-year public institutions. The State paid $6.3 million, or 49.8 percent, of their total $12.6 million construction cost.

Prior to 1965, there was no specific State policy regarding capital funding of auxiliary enterprise facilities. During this period, the State paid 47.7 percent of the total cost of auxiliary enterprise facilities. Auxiliary facility projects were negotiated individually among State agencies, institutions, and the Legislature during this period.

Governor Tawes, in 1965, established an executive policy that required capital funds for auxiliary enterprise facilities be provided by the institutions rather than by the State. Numerous exceptions were made to this policy which resulted in the State paying 44.4 percent of all auxiliary facility construction costs between 1965 and 1979.

The study which is currently in draft form identifies institutional requests for additional auxiliary enterprise facilities as well as for major renovations of existing

facilities. Nine alternative methods for funding the capital costs of auxiliary enterprise facilities are examined in the study. A recommendation will be made which takes into consideration both State and student ability to pay for such facilities, which treats all of the four-year public segments equitably, and which can be consistently applied to all of the public four-year segments/institutions. This report will be completed in fall 1980.

III. Implementation of Role and Mission Actions

The Plan identifies general segmental and institutional missions for public institutions. This Chapter deals with indicators which define various components of institutional mission. In addition, five year plans for academic program development are included to further delineate campus missions.

DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF PREDICTIVE INDICES FOR ADMISSION

The Plan provides that each public college and university develop appropriate indices for predicting student success in its programs. Each institution was to utilize such indices for admitting students to its freshman class beginning in the Fall of 1979 with full implementation not later than Fall, 1980.

Status

Table 1 summarizes the predictive indices now used or planned for use for Fall, 1980.

University of Maryland. The University of Maryland traditionally has utilized two predictive indices for freshman admission to its undergraduate programs. One index utilizes as predictors prior performance in secondary school as measured by both rank in class and grade average in academic subjects; the other utilizes as predictors the combined SAT score and high school grade average in academic subjects. Both indices were designed to be approximately equivalent in predicting academic success as measured by the grade average at the end of the first year. The University has modified its predictive indices effective in the Fall 1980. The new indices in effect raise the cut-off scores needed for assured admission. Under the new policy up to 15% of the new freshman class, University-wide, may be admitted as exemptions to the regular admission criteria as opposed to the current 6% for each campus.

State Universities and Colleges. Some of the institutions under the governance of the Board of Trustees of the State Universities and Colleges traditionally have had an open-door admission policy (the University of Baltimore does not accept new freshmen). A new policy adopted in 1979 by the Board of Trustees set a high school grade average of "C" as a minimum requirement for admission to the State Universities and Colleges. Each institution was required to develop a predictive index of academic success to admit students over and above this

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF PREDICTIVE INDICES

	Regular Admissions		Exemptions to Regular Admissions	
	Predictors	Criterion	% of Freshman Class	Criteria
BTSUC Bowie	1. SAT-V 2. SAT-M 3. HS GPA	Predicted Freshman GPA at least 2.0	15%	1. Participation in extra-curricular activities. 2. Demonstrated leadership. 3. Degree of improvement in academic grade average from freshman to senior year. 4. Unique work experience. 5. Membership in youth and community organization.
Coppin	1. SAT-V 2. SAT-M 3. HS GPA in English courses	Predicted Freshman GPA at least 2.0	15%	1. Motivation. 2. Time mgmt. strategies. 3. Goal clarification.
Frostburg	1. SAT-V 2. SAT-M 3. HS GPA in academic subjects	Predicted Freshman GPA at least 2.0	15%	1. Determinations of special need. 2. Extenuating circumstances. 3. Special value of a marginal student to some aspect of the college's programs.
Salisbury	1. SAT-V 2. SAT-M 3. HS GPA in academic subjects	Predicted 15 hrs of C or better at close of Freshman year (under study)	5%	1. Determinations of special need. 2. Extenuating circumstances. 3. Special value of a marginal student to some aspect of the college's programs.
Towson	1. SAT-V 2. SAT-M 3. TSWE 4. HS GPA in academic subjects	Predicted Freshman GPA at least 2.0	3%	1. Non-traditional variables. 2. Recommendations of H.S. faculty/counselors. 3. Personal interviews.

Morgan	Predictive Index will not be used in Fall 1980.			
St. Mary's	1. Until April 15: Combined SAT and HS GPA at least 900 and 2.5 respectively. 2. After April 15 (on space available basis) SAT and HS GPA at least 800 and 2.0 respectively.	Freshman GPA	5-10%	1. Clarity of purpose. 2. Maturity. 3. Motivation. 4. Understanding of the nature of a liberal arts college. 5. References 1-4 above are assessed through personal interviews and essays.
UM - All Campuses	Average in HS courses = C and HS Rank in top 40%; or sliding combination SAT and academic HSGPA from SAT= 1490 and GPA=1.01 to SAT= 400 and GPA=3.16	Freshman GPA	15% Univ-wide	UMBC: 1. Special talents 2. Motivation 3. Potential for academic success 2 and 3 above are assessed through letters of recommendation and interviews. UMCP: 1. Special aptitudes. 2. Leadership potential. 3. Extenuating personal and/or family circumstances. 4. Maturity and experience. UMES: 1. HS GPA between 1.5 - 2.0. 2. Letter of recommendation from principal or counselor. 3. Basic skills testing. 4. Interviews. 5. Exceptional talent or aptitude.

minimum requirement. The institutional indices adopted by the State Universities and Colleges utilize as predictors SAT scores and high school grade average (or a variation thereof). Also part of the new policy is a provision for each institution to admit up to 15% of its new freshman class as exemptions to the regular admission criteria. Salisbury State College and Towson State University have adopted lower limits - 5% and 3%, respectively.

Morgan State University. Morgan State University does not currently plan to utilize a predictive index for freshman admission as provided in the Plan.

St. Mary's College of Maryland. Based on a 1976 College Entrance Examination Board validity study, St. Mary's College has adopted as admission criteria combined SAT scores of no less than 900 and a high school grade point average of 2.5 or greater. After April 15 the criteria are lowered on a space available basis to combined SAT scores of 800 or above and a 2.0 high school average. St. Mary's will continue to review its predictive index in order to improve its validity. St. Mary's admits 5-10% of its freshman class as exemptions to regular admission criteria.

Assessment

University of Maryland. On the face of it, the new policy adopted by the University of Maryland will result in higher admission standards at UMCP, UMBC and UMES. However the associated 15% university-wide exemptions policy could negate the higher admissions standards depending on how it is implemented. For example, if the 15% policy is applied at each campus it could result in lower standards at UMCP and higher standards at UMBC and UMES. On the other hand, if the 15% policy is applied university-wide it could result in higher admission standards at UMCP and lower (or no change) at UMBC and/or UMES. The University contends, however, that the potential for such impact can be minimized by close monitoring to ensure that students admitted as exemptions exhibit equal or greater potential for success than assured admission students, although being measured by other than normal indicators.

State Universities and Colleges. The predictive indices developed by four institutions under the governance of the Board of Trustees of the State Universities and Colleges use as criterion a predicted freshman year grade point average of 2.0. This criterion should result in higher retention rates. A fifth institution, Salisbury State College, adopted as criterion "predicted 15 hours of C or better at close of freshman year". It is unclear how this criterion relates to retention. At the

present time Salisbury State College is reviewing this criterion.

Morgan State University. Morgan State University's fulfillment of its mission as the urban research-oriented doctoral-granting institution in the State will require a greatly improved retention rate. The development and implementation of a predictive index should result in a reduction of Morgan's attrition rate.

St. Mary's College of Maryland. St. Mary's two-tier admissions system should result in increasingly selective admissions.

Action

1. MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY SHOULD DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A PREDICTIVE INDEX TO ADMIT STUDENTS TO THE FRESHMAN CLASS OF 1981.

2. THE CRITERIA FOR REGULAR ADMISSION SHOULD BE CLEARLY STATED IN EACH INSTITUTION'S CATALOGUE.

EXEMPTIONS TO THE REGULAR ADMISSION CRITERIA

While adopting predictive indices, four-year institutions have included provisions for the admission of a proportion of the freshman class under criteria other than the predictive indices. This appears to be a sound policy for taking into account certain characteristics that may help to predict success for students who do not perform well on standardized tests.

Assessment

The criteria adopted by four-year institutions to admit students who would not be admitted under the predictive indices are by necessity general at this time. The academic progress of students admitted under these criteria should be carefully monitored and the criteria refined as more information becomes available.

Action

1. BEGINNING IN THE FALL OF 1980 FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS WILL REPORT TO THE SBHE THOSE STUDENTS ADMITTED UNDER THE SPECIAL CRITERIA.

2. THE SBHE WILL MONITOR THE ACADEMIC PROGRESS OF THE STUDENTS ADMITTED IN THIS SPECIAL CATEGORY.

MONITORING THE UTILIZATION AND EFFECTIVENESS OF PREDICTIVE INDICES

The First Annual Review of the State Plan provides for SBHE to monitor the utilization and effectivess of predictive indices. As part of the annual segmental and institutional reports each public college and university is to provide the SBHE with a profile of the academic preparation of the previous freshmen class. This profile includes as a minimum: mean high school grade point average, mean SAT-V and mean SAT-M.

Status

Tables 2 through 11 are profiles of the Fall 1979 freshman class enrolled in each of the State's public four-year colleges and universities. These data will be used as baselines for future monitoring of the utilization and effectiveness of the predictive indices. In measuring progress, each institution will be measured against its own baseline data. Comparisons of profile data among institions is not appropriate for this purpose.

The State Plan provides for each public four-year college and university to develop appropriate indices for predicting student success in its programs. There are two major reasons for the increased emphasis on evaluating student preparation prior to admission. First, high attrition rates at some institutions indicate a need to better identify those students who are likely to benefit from, and succeed in, programs of individual institutions. Second, it is questionable whether the duplication of developmental programs necessary if an open-door policy is maintained for all institutions is an efficient use of State resources. Additional considerations for the emphasis on evaluating student preparation are to ensure that the projected decrease in the college-age population and the ensuing competition for students will not result in lowering academic standards; and to provide a mechanism for the institutions which are to reduce their enrollments to become more selective.

The set of data presented in Tables 2 through 11 will be used as indicators of the utilization of the predictive indices

TABLE 2

PROFILE OF FRESHMAN CLASS
- BOWIE STATE COLLEGE -

	Fall 1979	Fall 1980
SAT-V Mean	323	
(N)	356	
SAT-M Mean	296	
(N)	356	
HS GPA Mean	N.A.	
(N)	N.A.	
Acceptance Rates (1)		
- In-State Students	86%	
- Out-of-State Students	32%	
% of freshman class admitted as exemptions (2)	-	
N of freshman class - actual (3)	344	
N of freshman class - State Plan limit (3), (4)	-	375

Attrition Rate

	Freshman Class (3)		
	1977	1978	1979
First year attrition rate	36%		*
Second year attrition rate		*	

* Data will be available in Spring, 1981

(1): Number of admissions divided by number of applications
(2): In Fall 1979 Bowie had an open-door admission policy
(3): Full-time only
(4): The State Plan did not provide for Fall 1979 freshman enrollment limitation at Bowie

TABLE 3

PROFILE OF FRESHMAN CLASS
- COPPIN STATE COLLEGE -

	Fall 1979	Fall 1980
SAT-V Mean	273	
(N)	441	
SAT-M Mean	298	
(N)	441	
HS GPA Mean	2.50	
(N)	441	
Acceptance Rate (1)		
- In-State Students	74%	
- Out-of-State Students	50%	
% of freshman class admitted as exemptions (2)	-	
N of freshman class - actual (3)	477	
N of freshman class - State Plan limit (3), (4)	-	43[illegible]

Attrition Rate

	Freshman Class (3)		
	1977	1978	1979
First year attrition rate	40%		*
Second year attrition rate		*	

* Data will be available in Spring, 1981

(1): Number of admissions divided by number of applications
(2): In Fall 1979 Coppin had an open-door admission policy
(3): Full-time only
(4): The State Plan did not provide for Fall 1979 freshman enrollment limitation at Coppin

TABLE 4

PROFILE OF FRESHMAN CLASS
- FROSTBURG STATE COLLEGE -

	Fall 1979	Fall 1980
SAT-V Mean	432	
(N)	700	
SAT-M Mean	462	
(N)	700	
HS GPA Mean	3.00	
(N)	700	
Acceptance Rate (1)		
- In-State Students	81%	
- Out-of-State Students	73%	
% of freshsman class admitted as exemptions (2)	-	
N of freshsman class - actual (3)	737	
N of freshman class - State Plan limit (3)	800	800

Attrition Rate

	Freshman Class (3)		
	1977	1978	1979
First Year Attrition Rate	30%		*
Second Year Attrition Rate		*	

* Data will be available in Spring, 1981

(1): Number of admissions divided by number of applications
(2): In Fall 1979 Frostburg had an open-door admission policy
(3): Full-time only

TABLE 5

PROFILE OF FRESHMAN CLASS
- SALISBURY STATE COLLEGE -

	Fall 1979	Fall 1980
SAT-V Mean	411	
(N)	621	
SAT-M Mean	446	
(N)	621	
HS GPA (1) Mean	2.66	
(N)	621	
Acceptance Rate (2)		
- In-State students	82%	
- Out-of-State students	75%	
% of freshman class admitted as exemptions (3)	-	
N of freshman class - actual (4)	712	
N of freshman class - State Plan limit (4)	800	725

Attrition Rate

	Freshman Class (4) 1977	1978	1979
First Year Attrition Rate	32%		*
Second Year Attrition Rate		*	

* Data will be available in Spring, 1981

(1): H.S. grade average in academic subjects only.
(2): Number of admissions divided by number of applications.
(3): In Fall 1979 Salisbury had an open-door admissions policy.
(4): Full-time only.

TABLE 6

PROFILE OF FRESHMAN CLASS
- TOWSON STATE UNIVERSITY -

	Fall 1979	Fall 1980
SAT-V Mean	431	
(N)	1931	
SAT-M Mean	464	
(N)	1931	
HS GPA (1) Mean	2.96	
(N)	1931	
Acceptance Rate (2)		
- In-State Students	83%	
- Out-of-State Students	69%	
% of freshman class admitted as exemptions	-	
N of freshman class - actual (3)	2,078	
N of freshman class - State Plan limit (3)	2,050	2,000

Attrition Rate

	Freshman Class (4)		
	1977	1978	1979
First Year Attrition Rate	29%		*
Second Year Attrition Rate		*	

* Data will be available in Spring, 1981

(1): H.S. grade average in academic subjects only
(2): Number of admissions divided by number of applications
(3): Full-time only

TABLE 7

PROFILE OF FRESHMAN CLASS
- MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY -

	Fall 1979	Fall 1980
SAT-V Mean	306	
(N)	853	
SAT-M Mean	329	
(N)	853	
HS GPA (1) Mean	2.65	
(N)	657	
Acceptance Rate (2)		
- In-State Students	85%	
- Out-of-State Students	74%	
Academic Rank in H.S. (1)		
- Top Fifth	18%	
- Second Fifth	22%	
(N)	617	
% of freshman class admitted as exemptions (3)	-	
N of freshman class - actual (4)	864	
N of freshman class - State Plan Limit (4), (5)	-	880

Attrition Rate

	Freshman Class (4) 1977	1978	1979
First Year Attrition Rate	41%		*
Second Year Attrition Rate		*	

* Data will be available in Spring, 1981

(1): Self-reported data.
(2): Number of applications divided by number of admissions.
(3): In Fall 1979 Morgan had an open-door admission policy.
(4): Full-time only.
(5): The State Plan did not provide for Fall 1979 freshman enrollment limitation at Morgan.

TABLE 8

PROFILE OF FRESHMAN CLASS
- ST. MARY'S COLLEGE -

	Fall 1979	Fall 1980
SAT-V Mean	466	
(N)	348	
SAT-M Mean	483	
(N)	348	
HS GPA Mean	2.79	
(N)	N.A.	
Acceptance Rate (1)		
- In-State Students	74%	
- Out-of-State Students	57%	
Academic Rank in H.S.		
- Top Fifth	38%	
- Second Fifth	25%	
(N)	317	
% of freshman class admitted as exemptions	N.A.	
N of freshman class - actual (2)	350	
N of freshman class - State Plan limit (2),(3)	-	375

Attrition Rate

	Freshman Class (2) 1977	1978	1979
First Year Attrition Rate	30%		*
Second Year Attrition Rate		*	

* Data will be available in Spring, 1981

(1): Number of admissions divided by number of applications.
(2): Full-time only.
(3): The State Plan did not provide for Fall 1979 freshman enrollment limitation at St. Mary's.

TABLE 9

PROFILE OF FRESHMAN CLASS
- UMBC -

	Fall 1979	Fall 1980
SAT-V Mean	422	
(N)	1304	
SAT-M Mean	460	
(N)	1304	
HS GPA Mean	3.04	
(N)	N.A.	
Acceptance Rate (1)		
- In-State Students	88%	
- Out-of-State Students	70%	
% of freshman class admitted as exemptions	6%	
N of freshman class - actual (2)	1387	
N of freshman class - State Plan limit (2),(3)	-	1550

Attrition Rate

	Freshman Class (2)		
	1977	1978	1979
First Year Attrition Rate	38%		*
Second Year Attrition Rate		*	

* Data will be available in Spring, 1981

(1): Number of admissions divided by number of applicants.
(2): Full-time only.
(3): The State Plan did not provide for Fall 1979 freshman enrollment limitation at UMBC.

TABLE 10

PROFILE OF FRESHMAN CLASS
- UMCP -

	Fall, 1979	Fall 1980
SAT-V Mean	450	
(N)	4899	
SAT-M Mean	510	
(N)	4899	
HS GPA Mean	N.A.	
(N)	N.A.	
Acceptance Rate (1)		
- In-State Students	89%	
- Out-of-State Students	78%	
% of freshman class admitted as exemptions	4.4%	
N of freshman class - actual (2)	5161	
N of freshman class - State Plan limit (2)	4040	4600

Attrition Rate

	Freshman Class (2) 1977	1978	1979
First Year Attrition Rate	23%		*
Second Year Attrition Rate		*	

* Data will be available in Spring, 1981

(1): Number of admissions divided by number of applications
(2): Full-time only

TABLE 11

PROFILE OF FRESHMAN CLASS
- UMES -

	Fall 1979	Fall 1980
SAT-V Mean	297	
(N)	N.A.	
SAT-M Mean	326	
(N)	N.A.	
HS GPA Mean	2.5	
(N)	N.A.	
Acceptance Rate (1)		
- In-State Students	88%	
- Out-of-State Students	78%	
% of freshman class admitted as exemptions	41%	
N of freshman class - actual (2)	352	
N of freshman class - State Plan Limit (2), (3)	-	450

Attrition Rate

	Freshman Class (2) 1978	1979
First Year Attrition Rate		*
Second Year Attrition Rate	*	

* Data will be available in Spring, 1981

(1): Number of admissions divided by number of applications.
(2): Full-time only.
(3): The State Plan did not provide for Fall 1979 freshman limitation at UMES.

and of their effectiveness in achieving the desired goals.

Percentage of Undergraduates in the Lower Division

The Plan recommends that by Fall 1982 each public college and university (except for UMCP) have no more than 60 percent of its undergraduates in the lower division (freshmen and sophomores). The goal for UMCP is 45%. These percentages of lower division enrollments would make Maryland institutions more comparable to their national counterparts in terms of lower and upper division emphasis and would be consistent with their identified missions of decreasing their emphasis on lower division education.

Status

Table 12 shows the percentages of lower division students for each of the past three years. Two schools, Towson and Salisbury, have remained in conformance with this goal for each of these years. Since Fall 1977, two schools (UMCP and Morgan) that had been above their goals have made progress. Two schools, Bowie and Frostburg, were within the desired range but have now moved slightly above it. Coppin and St. Mary's College have remained somewhat higher than desired for the past three years. Two schools, UMBC and UMES were above the desired level in Fall 1977 and have moved further above since that time, although UMES did show a decrease between 1978 and 1979.

Assessment

As in 1978, progress was made by UMCP in moving toward the 45% goal. Better progress (to 50.6% rather than to 51.9%) would have been shown had not UMCP exceeded its freshmen limitation for Fall 1979. Most other institutions above the desired levels have either progressed toward their goals or are relatively close to them. However, both UMES and UMBC are currently well above the desired proportions of lower division students and are above all other public colleges and universities in the proportion of freshmen and sophomores in their student bodies. One of the reasons for the high proportion of lower division students at UMES in 1978 was a 74% increase in new full-time freshmen between 1977 and 1978 (from 229 to 398). The number of such students, however, was slightly lower in 1979 (to 352) and the proportion of lower division students was also lower in 1979. At UMBC, there was a 17.5% increase in new full-time freshmen between 1978 and 1979 (from 1,180 to 1,387). However, even without these freshmen, UMBC would still have increased to 78% lower division, making it the highest public institution in the State in terms of freshmen and sophomore emphasis. UMBC's

TABLE 12

PERCENT OF CLASSIFIED UNDERGRADUATES IN THE LOWER DIVISION

	Fall 1977	Fall 1978	Fall 1979	Fall 1982 Goal
University of Maryland				
UMBC	63.2%	63.1%	78.8%	60%
UMCP	53.5%	52.6%	51.9%	45%
UMES	66.6%	82.7%	72.6%	60%
State Colleges and Universities				
Bowie	59.8%	58.5%	62.4%	60%
Coppin	66.3%	68.2%	66.0%	60%
Frostburg	57.0%	58.0%	60.5%	60%
Salisbury	60.8%	58.2%	56.7%	60%
Towson	54.5%	52.1%	53.7%	60%
Morgan State University				
	76.9%	73.3%	69.3%	60%
St. Mary's College				
	62.6%	62.2%	63.6%	60%

high attrition rate will have to be substantially reduced in order to approach the specified goal.

Action

EACH INSTITUTION SHOULD CONTINUE TO PLAN TO ACHIEVE ITS GOAL FOR PROPORTION OF LOWER DIVISION STUDENTS BY FALL 1982.

COORDINATION OF PROGRAMS BETWEEN COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

The Plan recommends that all public colleges and universities devote special attention to enrolling community college transfer students as part of their efforts to increase their emphasis on upper division enrollments. The First Annual review provides for Morgan and St. Mary's, which did not have formal articulation arrangements in existence or under development, to develop such arrangements.

Status

The University of Maryland has had a well-developed centrally coordinated program of articulation with community colleges. The arrangements have been updated as new programs have been added.

The institutions under the governance of the Board of Trustees have been developing formal articulation arrangements in phases during the past year. The first set of arrangements involving specialized/professional programs was completed in July 1980. The second phase is articulation with liberal arts programs. BTSUC anticipates completion of this phase by Spring 1981.

St. Mary's, as provided in the First Update of the Plan, has developed policies concerning the transferrability of courses into each of its divisions from those community colleges from which it receives most of its transfer students (Anne Arundel, Charles, Hagerstown, Montgomery, and Prince George's).

Morgan to date has not developed formal articulation arrangements with community colleges. Morgan indicates plans to establish an office of articulation during the 1980-81 academic year.

Trends in new transfer students enrolled are shown in Table 13.

Assessment

Associate degrees awarded in community college transfer programs continue to decline after several years of strong growth (FY 1975 - 3,207, FY 1976 -3,173, FY 1977 - 3,049, FY 1978 - 2,910, FY 1979 - 2,833). On the other hand, there has been continued growth in associate degrees awarded in community college occupational programs (FY 1975 - 2,842, FY 1976 - 3,045, FY 1977 - 3,325, FY 1978 - 3,691, FY 1979 - 3,896). Results of the SBCC followup study indicate increasing transfer rates to four-year institutions by students completing occupational programs. Therefore, increased emphasis on informing students in such programs of transfer policies is desirable.

All institutions, except Morgan, now have or are developing formal articulation policies. Morgan needs to develop such policies expeditiously in order to enhance its enrollment prospects and to increase its emphasis on upper division instruction.

Action

MORGAN SHOULD DEVELOP AND PUBLISH FORMAL ARTICULATION ARRANGEMENTS WITH BALTIMORE CITY AND COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGES FOR USE BEGINNING IN THE FALL OF 1981.

GRADUATE ENROLLMENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AND AT MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

The Plan provides for the University of Maryland and Morgan State University to increase the emphasis placed on graduate education. Morgan's emphasis in the graduate area is to be on urban-oriented programs. The State Colleges and Universites are to continue to offer masters programs and may contribute to joint doctoral or advanced certificate programs.

Status

Table 14 provides information for the past three years on graduate enrollments at each campus of the University of Maryland and at Morgan. In terms of total graduate enrollments, UMAB, UMES, and UMUC have had growth for each of the past two years; UMBC had stability between 1978 and 1979 after showing

TABLE 13

ENROLLMENT OF NEW COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFER STUDENTS

	Fall 1977	Fall 1978	Fall 1979
University of Maryland			
UMAB	Not provided		
UMBC	201	248	233
UMCP	1201	1175	1237
UMES	Not provided		
UMUC	Not provided		
State Colleges and Universities			
Bowie	60	64	78
Coppin	104	127	140
Frostburg	169	193	245
Salisbury	134	103	117
Towson	580	544	554
University of Baltimore	391	429	484
Morgan State University			
	Not provided		
St. Mary's			
	Not provided		

TABLE 14

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT TRENDS

	1977	1978	1979
Full Time			
UMAB	749	670	665
UMBC	86	93	119
UMCP	2789	2563	2581
UMES	0	3	10
UMUC	0	15	31
Morgan	179	143	137
Part-Time			
UMAB	484	645	691
UMBC	230	303	269
UMCP	4969	4920	4776
UMES	0	33	38
UMUC	234	384	562
Morgan	630	521	383
Total			
UMAB	1233	1315	1356
UMBC	316	396	388
UMCP	7758	7483	7357
UMES	0	36	48
UMUC	234	399	593
Morgan	809	664	520
Full-Time - Masters			
UMAB	689	603	597
UMBC	77	80	64
UMCP	1463	1226	1206
UMES	0	3	10
UMUC	0	15	31
Morgan	179	143	130
Full-Time - Doctoral			
UMAB	52	62	65
UMBC	9	13	19
UMCP	1270	1270	1303
UMES	0	0	0
UMUC	0	0	0
Morgan	0	0	0

TABLE 14 (Cont'd)

Full-Time - Unclassified			
UMAB	8	5	3
UMBC	0	0	36
UMCP	56	67	72
UMES	0	0	0
UMUC	0	0	7
Morgan	7	15	0
Part-Time - Masters			
UMAB	324	486	526
UMBC	177	230	149
UMCP	2675	2485	2299
UMES	0	33	38
UMUC	234	384	562
Morgan	556	448	316
Part-Time - Doctoral			
UMAB	123	126	144
UMBC	7	14	26
UMCP	1696	1694	1718
UMES	0	0	0
UMUC	0	0	0
Morgan	0	0	12
Part-Time - Unclassified			
UMAB	37	33	21
UMBC	46	59	94
UMCP	598	741	759
UMES	0	0	0
UMUC	0	0	0
Morgan	74	73	55

growth between 1977 and 1978; and UMCP and Morgan have had declines for each of the past two years. All of the growth at UMAB has been among part-time students primarily at the masters level. UMES and UMUC had growth at the masters level primarily among part-time students. Morgan lost both full-time and part-time enrollments at the masters level. Morgan also enrolled its first group of doctoral students this past fall. UMCP lost part-time students between 1978 and 1979 after losing primarily full-time students between 1977 and 1978. Virtually all the loss in graduate students at UMCP since 1977 has been at the masters level. UMCP increased both full-time and part-time doctoral enrollments in fall 1979, after having stability between 1977 and 1978.

Table 15 shows trends in graduate enrollments at the State Colleges and Universities. All enrollments shown are for masters programs. In addition to its graduate enrollments, the University of Baltimore enrolled 914 students in its law school in Fall, 1979. Trends in total graduate enrollments were mixed in this segment with The University of Baltimore having growth, Coppin and Frostburg having relative stability, and Bowie and Towson institutions showing declines. Bowie has had growth since 1977 in full-time students while Coppin and Frostburg have grown slightly in part-time enrollments. The University of Baltimore has had strong growth among both full-time and part-time graduate students.

Assessment

The University of Maryland has been quite active in evaluating and planning graduate programs. Significant efforts include completion of a major report (not yet released), implementation of new graduate programs, expansion of the MBA program, and visits by faculty to regional campuses to recruit graduate students. In addition, the fact that the University was able to increase its doctoral-level enrollments is a positive indicator. The University has identified improved financial aid for graduate students as an important priority in order to become more competitive for graduate students.

Morgan's graduate enrollments have continued to decline. The major factors identified by Morgan for this decline are increased admissions requirements and a shrinking market for its masters programs. Morgan's newly implemented doctoral program in urban education leadership and masters programs in architecture and urban planning appear to have the potential for enhancing Morgan's graduate enrollment prospects. The graduate programs at Morgan merit intensive and continuing evaluation and careful planning at the institutional level if Morgan is to enhance its urban graduate thrust in the future.

TABLE 15

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT TRENDS
STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

	1977	1978	1979
Full Time			
Bowie	52	51	68
Coppin	78	71	63
Frostburg	75	96	66
Salisbury	57	41	44
Towson	165	151	131
University of Baltimore	134	131	220
Part-Time			
Bowie	868	794	762
Coppin	178	204	192
Frostburg	482	472	494
Salisbury	677	676	552
Towson	1722	1682	1323
University of Baltimore	1140	1198	1261
Total			
Bowie	920	845	830
Coppin	256	275	255
Frostburg	557	568	560
Salisbury	734	717	596
Towson	1887	1833	1454
University of Baltimore	1274	1329	1481

A major challenge faced by most of the State Colleges and Universities is maintenance of enrollments at the masters level in light of the decreasing need by teachers in the State to obtain further graduate education for certification.

Action

THE PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES SHOULD CONTINUE TO PROVIDE ANNUAL STATUS REPORTS ON THEIR EFFORTS TO ENHANCE THEIR GRADUATE MISSIONS IN THE ANNUAL PLANNING PROCESS.

RESEARCH PROGRAMS

The Statewide Plan identifies research as one of the primary roles of the University of Maryland and of Morgan State University. Morgan's specialized research emphasis is to be on urban problems. The research mission of the State Universities and Colleges is to be limited in scope.

Status

Contract and grant awards provide a good measure of the extent to which faculty members successfully compete with other faculty throughout the country. Table 16 shows the contracts and grants awarded to the campuses at the University of Maryland during the past four years. Overall, the University received 2.8% more in funding in FY 1979 than in FY 1978. The number of grants received increased by 12.8%. While not all awards are for research, about two-thirds are (university-wide) and many others are research-related.

All campuses except UMCP had increases in the amounts received and all except CEES had increases in the numbers of awards received. The decrease in the amount awarded to UMCP was the result of an unusually large amount received in FY 1978 and attributable primarily to a decline in federal support of about 9% from FY 1978. However, federal funds were 23% higher than in FY 1977 and total from all sources was 31% higher than that year.

One of the major problems facing the University in obtaining research grants is providing seed money for areas having the potential for receiving external support. In the past the University has had a small program, the General Research Board, for providing such grants. The awards provided to faculty under this program are shown in Table 17. In FY 1980, the University established a Basic Research Program to

TABLE 16

CONTRACTS AND GRANTS RECEIVED

	FY 1976	FY 1977	FY 1978	FY 1979
UMAB				
Amount	$27,986,416	$21,305,178	$20,551,251	$22,187,247
No.	219	265	192	219
UMBC				
Amount	1,255,183	1,323,643	1,336,962	1,559,223
No.	46	50	51	48
UMCP				
Amount	22,422,098	21,122,083	29,209,560	27,621,877
No.	733	672	891	1,033
UMES				
Amount	1,428,501	1,472,208	2,659,987	2,289,971
No.	25	34	34	40
UMUC				
Amount	1,404,925	1,006,973	890,112	1,836,648
No.	36	13	9	12
CEES				
Amount	1,382,716	1,611,479	1,624,762	2,353,964
No.	38	49	53	35
TOTAL				
Amount	5[illegible],879,839	47,841,564	56,272,634	57,848,930
No.	1,097	1,095	1,230	1,387

TABLE 17

GRANTS THROUGH THE GENERAL RESEARCH BOARD

		FY 1977	FY 1978	FY 1979
UMAB	Amount	$24,346	$21,095	$29,122
	No.	25	22	23
UMBC	Amount	$39,306	$39,306	$39,306
	No.	17	21	20
UMCP	Amount	$182,115	$371,480	$287,315
	No.	71	86	83
UMES	Amount	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
	No.	0	0	0

perform this function and for the first time received State aid ($1.3M). This amount is to be matched by overhead set aside from contracts received. In addition to providing seed money, the program will provide awards in areas where grant potential is limited and will provide support in preparing proposals.

Morgan's major urban-research effort will be focused through its newly-formed Institute for Urban Research. Funding was provided to the Institute by the State beginning in FY 1979. To date, no external funds have been received to support projects of the Institute. Outside of the Institute, Morgan was awarded 12 contracts and grants totaling $1,090,808 by outside agencies in FY 1980.

The State Colleges and Universities received 22 research grants totaling $422,753 in FY 1979. By institution, these were distributed as follows: Bowie - $89,349 (4); Coppin - $135,020 (3); Salisbury - $10,000 (1); Towson - $86,312 (3); The University of Baltimore - $102,072 (11). In addition, numerous contracts and grants of a non-research nature were awarded to these institutions.

PUBLIC SERVICE

The Plan provides that one of the University of Maryland's major roles be Statewide public service; Morgan's, public service to Baltimore City; and other public institutions, regional and community services.

Status

All public institutions provide numerous public service programs. Most are closely tied to the geographical areas in which they operate.

A comprehensive listing of public service programs is beyond the scope of this document. However, virtually all public institutions make their facilities available to the public, support cultural events open to the public, and offer noncredit courses. Some additional examples of public services follow. Bowie State College provides faculty assistance to community agencies and industries in the southern counties, supports a program of parental education, and provides services to the elderly of the community. Coppin sponsors the Urban Economic Development Center for minority businesses, supports a training program for security guards, and sponsors the Summer Enrichment Program for students ages 8-15. Salisbury provides facilities for a regional museum and supports a faculty speakers

bureau. Towson is the headquarters for the Maryland Council on Economic Education and has a program of exhibiting art in nearby communities. The University of Baltimore provides legal counseling to the elderly and supports a seminar on providing services to the handicapped. St. Mary's serves as the host for the Tidewater Music Festival, sponsors a summer music camp for high school students, and sponsors a summer camp for students ages 6-12. Morgan provides programs for community leadership training, dealing with alcohol and drug abuse, and communicating with the deaf. The community colleges as a component of their public service programs, conduct an annual survey to determine the public service needs of their communities.

The campuses of the University of Maryland have numerous regional and statewide programs of public service. A noteworthy development is the emphasis being placed by the University of Maryland on Statewide public service. Among other things the University is in the process of centralizing the coordination of the public service function and providing for increased recognition for public service activities in evaluating faculty members. Planning for public service is also a major aspect of the University's planning project being carried out by the Carnegie Task Force.

FURTHER DELINEATION OF CAMPUS MISSIONS - FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM PLANS

The Statewide Plan identifies general segmental missions for the University of Maryland, the State Colleges and Universities, and the Community Colleges. Institutional missions are identified for Morgan and St. Mary's. The First Annual Review provides for more precise specification of missions in this Review. The State Board provided the guidance that these mission specifications should consist of five-year academic program plans.

Tables 18-28 contain the following mission information for each campus: degrees to be offered, major areas in which programs will be developed in the future, and academic programs that are planned to be proposed during the next five years.

The five-year program plans operationally define the future mission direction of each institution. These five-year academic program plans will be updated annually as part of the Annual Review of the Plan.

The SBHE will continue to consider each proposal for a new Academic Program on its merits, the need for it, its desegregation impact and on the judged ability of the institution to offer a quality program. At the same time, use of these five-year plans as blueprints for the future should significantly reduce the amount of concern about duplication by institutions and enable each institution to understand where

12

others plan to move in the future.

Five year academic program plans are not included for UMAB and UMUC. The University currently has no plans for proposing new programs for UMAB during the next five years. The University College presently offers three programs: (1) The associate degree in General Studies (to active duty military personnel); (2) The bachelors degree in General Studies; and (3) The master's degree in General Administration. The mission of the University College is under review by the University of Maryland and program plans will await the outcome of this review.

TABLE 18

* INSTITUTION: Bowie

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters
FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Arts and Science Core, Public Affairs and Services, Education, Allied Health, Crafts

FIVE YEAR PROGRAM PLAN:

Academic Year 1980-81:

Academic Year 1981-82: B - Technology
B - Criminal Justice
B - Business Ed.

Academic Year 1982-83: B - Gerontology
B - Special Ed.

Academic Year 1983-84:

Academic Year 1984-85:

TABLE 19

* INSTITUTION: Coppin

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters
FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Arts and Science Core,
Human Resource Services,
Education Specialties

FIVE YEAR PROGRAM PLAN:

Academic Year 1980-81:

Academic Year 1981-82: B - Industrial Hygiene
B - Actuarial Science

Academic Year 1982-83: B - Public Admin.

Academic Year 1983-84: B - Visual and Hearing Impaired

Academic Year 1984-85: B - Industrial Safety

TABLE 20

* INSTITUTION: Frostburg

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters
FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Arts and Science Core, Business, Education, Natural Resources

FIVE YEAR PROGRAM PLAN:

Academic Year 1980-81: B - Reclamation

Academic Year 1981-82:

Academic Year 1982-83: M - Developmental Ed.
M - Special Ed.
B - Social Work

Academic Year 1983-84: B - Computer Science

Academic Year 1984-85: B - Music Therapy

TABLE 21

* INSTITUTION: Salisbury

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters
FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Arts and Science Core, Education, Business

FIVE YEAR PROGRAM PLAN:

Academic Year 1980-81:

Academic Year 1981-82: M - Business Administration
B - Art

Academic Year 1982-83: B - Music
B - Mass Media

Academic Year 1983-84: B - Political Science
B - Religious Studies

Academic Year 1984-85: B - Chinese

TABLE 22

* INSTITUTION: Towson

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters
FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Arts and Science Core, Fine Arts, Humanities, Communications, Allied Health, Business Administration, Education

FIVE YEAR PROGRAM PLAN:

Academic Year 1980-81: M - Elem. School P.E.
M - Mass. Comm.

Academic Year 1981-82: M - Occupational Therapy
M - Fine Arts

Academic Year 1982-83: B - Music Merchandising
B - Dance/Dance Ed.
M - Business Communications
D Of Arts - Teaching (Degree awarded by Morgan)

Academic Year 1983-84: B - Fine Arts
B - Music Therapy
M - Communications Systems Management

Academic Year 1984-85:

TABLE 23

* INSTITUTION: University of Baltimore

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters, First-Prof. (Law)
FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Arts and Science Core
Business, Law, Public Adm.

FIVE YEAR PROGRAM PLAN:

Academic Year 1980-81: B - Applied Statistics
B - Administrative Technology

Academic Year 1981-82: D - Public Adm. (Degree awarded by doctoral-granting institution)

Academic Year 1982-83: D - Bus. Adm. (Degree awarded by doctoral-granting institution)

Academic Year 1983-84:

Academic Year 1984-85:

TABLE 24

* INSTITUTION: Morgan

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters, Doctorate
FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Arts and Science Core,
Business, Education,
Transportation, Urban Affairs,
International Studies

FIVE YEAR PROGRAM PLAN:

Academic Year 1980-81: M - Transportation Studies
M - Intl. Bus. and Mgt.
B - Small Bus. Admin.

Academic Year 1981-82: B - Management
B - Real Estate
B - Child Devel.

Academic Year 1982-83: D - Sociology
D - Science Ed.
M - Early Child. Ed.

Academic Year 1983-84: D - Management
D - Religious Studies
D - Early Childhood Ed.

Academic Year 1984-85: D - Reading
D - Special Ed.

TABLE 25

*INSTITUTION: St. Mary's

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters
FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Arts and Science Core, Selected Regional Service Programs

FIVE YEAR PROGRAM PLAN:

Academic Year 1980-81: B - Anthropology/Sociology
B - Political Science
B - Economics/Business

Academic Year 1981-82: M - American Colonial History and Archeology

Academic Year 1982-83: B - Psychology
B - Philosophy/Religious Studies

Academic Year 1983-84: B - Chemistry

Academic Year 1984-85:

TABLE 26

* INSTITUTION: UMBC

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters, Doctorate
FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Arts and Science Core, Physical and Biological Sciences, Engineering, Health Services Administration, Policy Science, Psychology, Computer Science and Related Areas, Mathematical Statistics, Ethnomusicology

FIVE YEAR PROGRAM PLAN:

Academic Year 1980-81: B - Nursing
M,D - Ethnomusicology

Academic Year 1981-82: B - Computer Science

Academic Year 1982-83: M - Operations Mgt.
M - Health Care Fiscal Plng.
M - Toxicological Chem.
M,D - Mathematical Statistics
B - Engineering

Academic Year 1983-84: M - Health Physics
M - Health Science Policy
M - Emergency Health Services
D - Human Services Psych.
D - Operations Mgt.
D - Toxicological Chem.
B - Technology

Academic Year 1984-85: M - Water Resources Plng. and Mgt.
M - Sports Medicine
M - Preventive Health Ed.

TABLE 27

* INSTITUTION: UMCP

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters, Doctorate
FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Comprehensive

FIVE YEAR PROGRAM PLAN:

Academic Year 1980-81:

Academic Year 1981-82: AC, D - Geology
M - Public Mgt.
M - Housing and Int. Environments

Academic Year 1982-83: M - Agriculture
B - Jewish Studies
M - Theater
M - Sports Mgt.
D - Food, Nutrition, and Inst. Adm.

Academic Year 1983-84: M - Primate Ecology and Museum Tech.
B,M,D - Linguistics
M - Industrial Rel. and Labor Studies
D - Engineering

Academic Year 1984-85: M - Arts Mgt.
B - East Asian Studies
B - Romance Languages
M - Anthropology
B - Applied Social Sciences
B,M,D - Industrial and Systems Engineering
M - Engineering Mgt.
B - Engineering Materials
M - Computer Science

TABLE 28

* INSTITUTION: UMES

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters, Doctoral (only with other University campuses)

FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Arts and Science Core, Agriculture, Environmental Science, Technology, Allied Health

Academic Year 1980-81: B - Poultry Mgt. Tech. (Approved)
B - Physical Therapy (Approved)

Academic Year 1981-82: B - Agri-Business

Academic Year 1982-83: B - Agri-Engineering
B - Radiologic Technology
M - Micro Business

Academic Year 1983-84: B - Agricultural Mechanization

Academic Year 1984-85: M - Poultry Technology Management

IV. Enrollments

The State Board for Higher Education, in providing guidance for the 1980 update of the Statewide Plan, requested that ten-year freshman enrollment plans be developed for all public four-year institutions.

The Statewide Plan already contains enrollment limitations for new full-time freshmen at four public four-year institutions: UMCP, Frostburg, Salisbury, and Towson. There were several reasons for applying limitations to these particular schools. First, all had shown strong growth and were operating near or above the optimal capacities of their facilities. Second, the State Plan provides for decreased emphasis on lower division education and increased emphasis on upper division and graduate education at public colleges and universities, particularly at UMCP. Third, because these institutions have had significant growth recently and appear to have the potential for additional growth, freshmen limitations provide a means by which to make these institutions increasingly selective in admitting students. Finally, limitations appear to be a means by which enrollments can be distributed more evenly among institutions, thus helping to alleviate the problem of having institutions operating at a wide variety of levels in relation to their capacities.

For the most part, institutions have adhered to their freshman limitations. Frostburg was over its limit in 1978. In 1979, all institutions but UMCP were near or under their limitations. UMCP exceeded its limitation by 761 students (see Table 29).

Planning for freshman enrollments is important because Maryland faces a sharp decline in high school graduates in the near future. This is a direct result of a sustained decrease in births from 1964 through 1976, interrupted by a slight increase in 1969 and 1970. A similar situation exists nationwide, although the magnitude of the decline will vary by State. Generally, northeastern states will experience the largest declines. Maryland's decline will be somewhat less severe than the average for northeastern states but greater than the national average.

TABLE 29

COMPARISON OF ENROLLMENTS AND LIMITATIONS
FOR NEW FULL-TIME FRESHMEN

	Actuals					1979
	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	Limitation
UMCP	5,030	5,214	5,500	4,810	5,161	4,400
Towson	1,915	1,834	2,157	1,998	2,078	2,050
Frostburg	689	694	716	850	737	800
Salisbury	664	769	857	688	712	800

Source: SBHE Enrollment Information System

In addition to a decline in Maryland high school graduates, Maryland institutions, particularly those in the independent sector, may be affected by the greater than average declines in high school graduates in northeastern states. Of all out-of-State students enrolled as full-time undergraduates, 65% come from states that will have greater declines in high school graduates than Maryland: New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia. There will, however, probably be a good deal of variation in the enrollment trends for institutions in the independent sector, as a wide variety of factors affect the enrollment prospects of this diverse group of institutions.

In the Fall of 1979, Maryland institutions enrolled about 27,700 new full-time freshmen (see Table 30). Of these, about 3,800 were from other states and about 800 were from foreign countries. Given the current situation, the enrollment projections in Table 31 are the best estimates of new full-time freshmen for the next 10 years. Overall, there will be a 12.4% decline between 1980 and 1989. The projections take into account that the States from which Maryland draws most of its out-of-State students will have greater declines in high school seniors than Maryland.

Unlike many other states, Maryland has a relatively large potential pool of additional students - those leaving the State to enroll in postsecondary institutions. Although it is not possible to obtain a precise count of the number of students leaving the State, it is estimated that about 8,000 high school graduates did so this past year (about a quarter of the students going on to college). Projections of high school graduates remaining in the State and leaving the State under current conditions are shown in Table 32.

Studies undertaken by the SBHE have shown that over half of the State's "A" students leave and over 80% of the National Merit and National Achievement Semifinalists leave the State. The five major reasons cited by high ability students for leaving the State are, in order: academic reputation, admission selectivity, campus size (for UMCP), programs for high ability students, and merit-based financial aid. The focus of the Plan has been on improving the attractiveness of Maryland institutions by addressing these areas. To the extent that Maryland institutions succeed in increasingly appealing to high ability students, they will attract students from the pool currently going out of State. The pool is large enough that retaining more students in-State while keeping the current share of the out-of-State market could significantly lessen the enrollment decline that is expected under current conditions. In 1979, about twice as many students (8,000) left Maryland to enroll in college as freshmen as entered Maryland from other states (3,800). Ideally, Maryland should have a balance between freshmen entering the State and those leaving the State. Table

TABLE 30

DISTRIBUTION OF NEW FULL-TIME FRESHMEN
FALL, 1979*

	In-State	Out-Of-State	Foreign	Total
A. By Place of Residence Within Segments				
Community Colleges	10,502 (94%)	281 (3%)	366 (3%)	11,149 (100%)
St. Mary's	323 (92%)	26 (7%)	1 (0%)	350 (100%)
Morgan	558 (65%)	287 (33%)	19 (2%)	864 (100%)
BTSUC	4,003 (92%)	306 (7%)	39 (1%)	4,348 (100%)
Univ. of Md.	5,486 (79%)	1,146 (17%)	282 (4%)	6,914 (100%)
Independents	2,244 (55%)	1,731 (42%)	111 (3%)	4,086 (100%)
TOTAL	23,116 (83%)	3,777 (14%)	818 (3%)	27,711 (100%)
B. By Place of Residence Among Segments				
Community Colleges	10,502 (45%)	281 (7%)	366 (45%)	11,149 (40%)
St. Mary's	323 (1%)	26 (1%)	1 (0%)	350 (1%)
Morgan	558 (2%)	287 (8%)	19 (2%)	864 (3%)
BTSUC	4,003 (17%)	306 (8%)	39 (5%)	4,348 (16%)
Univ. of Md.	5,486 (24%)	1,146 (30%)	282 (34%)	6,914 (25%)
Independents	2,244 (10%)	1,731 (46%)	111 (14%)	4,086 (15%)
TOTAL	23,116 (100%)	3,777 (100%)	818 (100%)	27,711 (100%)

* Note: Unknowns have been prorated into known categories within each segment.

Percentages may not sum to 100% because of rounding.

TABLE 30 (Cont'd)

NEW FULL-TIME FRESHMEN
FALL, 1979

	In-State	Out-of-State	Foreign	Unknown	Total
C. By Institution					
Community Colleges					
Allegany	827	92	1		920
Anne Arundel	981	1		1	983
Catonsville	882	9	4		895
Cecil	91			9	100
Charles	397		1		398
Chesapeake	185				185
CCB	1,016		44	42	1,102
Dundalk	185				185
Essex	868			1	869
Frederick	256	10			266
Garrett	150	14			164
Hagerstown	234			128	362
Harford	432	8		1	441
Howard	292		1	1	294
Mont-Rockville	1,559	43	192	21	1,815
Mont-Takoma Park	249	49	89	11	398
Mont-Germantown	126	1	2	1	130
Prince George's	1,431	48	25		1,504
Wor-Wic	137	1			138
TOTAL	10,298	276	359	216	11,149
St. Mary's	323	26	1		350
Morgan	534	275	18	37	864
BTSCU					
Bowie	316	21	7		344
Coppin	458	14	5		477
Frostburg	674	61	2		737
Salisbury	619	87	5	1	712
Towson	1,933	123	20	2	2,078
TOTAL	4,000	306	39	3	4,348
University of Maryland					
UMBC	1,253	65	42	27	1,387
UMCP	3,991	926	230	14	5,161
UMES	198	145	9		352
UMUC	11	3			14
TOTAL	5,453	1,139	281	41	6,914

TABLE 30 (Cont'd)

NEW FULL-TIME FRESHMEN
FALL, 1979

	In-State	Out-Of-State	Foreign	Unknown	Total
Independent Institutions					
Md. Institute of Art	108	62	1		171
Cap. Inst. of Tech.	107	22	42		171
Columbia Union	63	116	6		185
Eastern Christian	6				6
Goucher	62	175	10		247
Hagerstown Bus.	44	70			114
Hood	79	122			201
Loyola	581	67	10		658
Mt. St. Mary's	152	256			408
Notre Dame	124	42	11		177
St. Mary's Sem and Un.	1	10			11
Villa Julie	235	5	1		241
Wash. Bible	48	53	6		107
Western Md.	283	88	2		373
Wash. College	104	94			198
St. John's	13	93			106
Antioch	63	3			66
Johns Hopkins	147	425	18		590
Peabody	24	28	4		56
TOTAL	2,244	1,731	111		4,086

TABLE 31

PROJECTIONS OF NEW FULL-TIME FRESHMEN
ATTENDING MARYLAND INSTITUTIONS
(Assuming Current Conditions)

	Maryland Residents	From Other States	Foreign	Total
1980	23,015	3,710	800	27,525
1981	22,864	3,649	800	27,313
1982	22,931	3,584	800	27,315
1983	21,371	3,438	800	25,609
1984	20,756	3,266	800	24,822
1985	20,232	3,095	800	24,127
1986	19,946	2,985	800	23,731
1987	20,288	2,969	800	24,057
1988	20,868	3,024	800	24,692
1989	20,391	2,918	800	24,109
% Change (1980-89)	-11.4%	-21.3%	No Change	-12.4%

TABLE 32

PROJECTIONS OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES
AND
PLACES OF COLLEGE ATTENDANCE
(Assuming Current Conditions)

	H. S. Graduates	College-Bound	Leaving State	Staying in State
1980	62,202	31,101	8,086	23,015
1981	61,794	30,897	8,033	22,864
1982	61,977	30,988	8,057	22,931
1983	57,759	28,880	7,509	21,371
1984	56,097	28,048	7,292	20,756
1985	54,679	27,340	7,108	20,232
1986	53,907	26,954	7,008	19,946
1987	54,833	27,416	7,128	20,288
1988	56,400	28,200	7,332	20,868
1989	55,111	27,556	7,165	20,391
% Change (1980-89)	-11.4%	-11.4%	-11.4%	-11.4%

33 shows how many additional Maryland high school seniors would have to be attracted each year in order to have the same number of freshmen leaving as entering in ten years. Table 34 shows freshman enrollment projections under this condition.

These projections represent an ideal. It will be extremely difficult to attain them in 10 years. However, if institutions do make inroads in the near future into the pool of students leaving the State, enrollments above the levels projected under current conditions can realistically be anticipated. It is prudent to utilize for planning purposes projections which assume that Maryland will retain enough students now leaving the State to attain a more reasonable balance within 10 years. These are shown in Table 35. Table 36 shows the freshman limitations for public four-year institutions. Table 37 shows estimates for community colleges and independent institutions. Within each of these two groups of institutions, it is likely that there will be a good deal of variation.

The planning projections are very close (within 100 in 1980 and within 200 in both 1981 and 1982) to those made under current conditions. The advantage of this is that the ability levels of entering classes and the college plans of high school seniors can be monitored closely to determine if more high ability students are attending Maryland institutions. This continual monitoring will provide the basis for annually updating freshmen projections. The success of Maryland institutions in attracting high ability students during these next three years will indicate the extent to which the planning projections are realistic for the longer term.

TABLE 33

ADJUSTED PROJECTIONS OF MARYLAND RESIDENTS
ENROLLING AS NEW FULL-TIME FRESHMEN
IN MARYLAND INSTITUTIONS
(Assuming balance between those leaving
and entering the State by 1989)

	Md. Residents Who Would Normally Stay	Md. Residents Staying in State Who Would Normally Leave	Adjusted Total Md. Staying In-State
1980	23,015	625	23,640
1981	22,864	1,107	23,971
1982	22,931	1,656	24,587
1983	21,371	1,754	23,125
1984	20,756	2,191	22,947
1985	20,232	2,623	22,855
1986	19,946	3,018	22,964
1987	20,228	3,491	23,719
1988	20,868	3,969	24,837
1989	20,391	4,247	24,638

TABLE 34

ADJUSTED PROJECTIONS OF NEW FULL-TIME FRESHMAN ENROLLMENTS IN MARYLAND INSTITUTIONS
(Assuming balance between those leaving and entering the State by 1989)

	Adj. Md. Residents	Out-Of-State	Foreign	Total
1980	23,640	3,710	800	28,150
1981	23,971	3,649	800	28,420
1982	24,587	3,584	800	28,971
1983	23,125	3,438	800	27,363
1984	22,947	3,266	800	27,013
1985	22,855	3,095	800	26,750
1986	22,964	2,985	800	26,749
1987	23,719	2,969	800	27,488
1988	24,837	3,024	800	28,661
1989	24,638	2,918	800	28,356

TABLE 35

COMPARISON OF PLANNING PROJECTIONS
WITH THOSE UNDER CURRENT AND OPTIMISTIC ASSUMPTIONS
NEW FULL-TIME FRESHMEN

	Projections Under Current Conditions	Planning Projections	Projections Under Optimistic Conditions
1980	27,525	27,590	28,150
1981	27,312	27,500	28,420
1982	27,315	27,520	28,971
1983	25,609	26,745	27,363
1984	24,822	26,210	27,013
1985	24,127	25,550	26,750
1986	23,731	25,130	26,749
1987	24,057	25,500	27,488
1988	24,692	26,100	28,661
1989	24,109	25,500	28,356

TABLE 36

ENROLLMENT LIMITATIONS
NEW FULL-TIME FRESHMEN

University of Maryland

	UMBC	UMCP	UMES	UMUC	TOTAL
1977	1,120	5,577	229	0	6,926
1978	1,180	4,810	398	11	6,399
1979	1,387	5,161	352	14	6,914
1980	1,550	4,600	450	0	6,600
1981	1,600	4,500	450	0	6,550
1982	1,600	4,400	450	0	6,450
1983	1,600	4,300	450	0	6,350
1984	1,600	4,200	450	0	6,250
1985	1,600	4,100	450	0	6,150
1986	1,600	4,000	450	0	6,050
1987	1,600	4,000	450	0	6,050
1988	1,600	4,000	450	0	6,050
1989	1,600	4,000	450	0	6,050
% Change (1980-89)	+3.2%	-13.0%	0%	0%	-8.3%

BTSUC

	Bowie	Coppin	Frost.	Salis.	Towson	Total
1977	259	395	716	857	2,157	4,384
1978	345	473	850	688	1,998	4,354
1979	344	477	737	712	2,078	4,348
1980	375	435	800	725	2,000	4,335
1981	375	425	800	750	2,000	4,350
1982	400	420	800	750	1,950	4,320
1983	425	410	800	750	1,900	4,285
1984	450	410	800	750	1,800	4,210
1985	450	410	800	750	1,700	4,110
1986	450	405	800	750	1,700	4,105
1987	450	400	800	750	1,700	4,100
1988	450	400	800	750	1,700	4,100
1989	450	400	800	750	1,700	4,100
% Change (1980-89)	+ 20%	-8.0%	0%	+3.4%	-15.0%	-5.4%

TABLE 36 (Cont'd)

ENROLLMENT LIMITATIONS
NEW FULL-TIME FRESHMEN

	St. Mary's	Morgan	Total Public Colleges and Universities
1977	268	1,066	12,644
1978	330	873	11,016
1979	350	864	12,476
1980	375	880	12,190
1981	400	800	12,100
1982	400	800	11,970
1983	400	800	11,835
1984	400	800	11,660
1985	400	800	11,460
1986	400	800	11,355
1987	400	800	11,350
1988	400	800	11,350
1989	400	800	11,350
% Change (1980-89)	+6.7%	-9.1%	-6.9%

TABLE 37

PLANNING PROJECTIONS
NEW FULL-TIME FRESHMEN

	Public Four-Year	Community Colleges	Independents	Total
1980	12,190	11,400	4,000	27,590
1981	12,100	11,450	3,950	27,500
1982	11,970	11,600	3,950	27,520
1983	11,835	11,150	3,760	26,745
1984	11,660	10,900	3,650	26,210
1985	11,460	10,550	3,540	25,550
1986	11,355	10,325	3,450	25,130
1987	11,350	10,700	3,450	25,500
1988	11,350	11,100	3,650	26,100
1989	11,350	10,600	3,550	25,500
% Change (1980-89)	-6.9%	-7.0%	-11.3%	-7.6%

V. Programs

The major objectives of the Plan in the area of Academic Programs are on maintaining and improving quality, avoiding unnecessary duplication, selectively dealing with access problems, and developing programs at underenrolled campuses.

ACCESS TO PART-TIME AND EVENING GRADUATE PROGRAMS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

The Plan recommends that the University of Maryland increase program offerings for part-time and evening graduate students particularly at the UMCP campus.

Status

Table 38 indicates trends in part-time graduate enrollments for the past five years. Table 39 shows trends in graduate credit hours offered in the evening (after 5 p.m.).

Assessment

UMCP has had stability in part-time graduate enrollments during the past five years. The campus, however, had a decline in graduate credit hours offered in the evening in 1979. To at least some extent, the decreasing demand for graduate level education courses, which have historically been heavily enrolled by part-time evening students, has made it difficult for UMCP to serve increasing numbers of part-time evening students. However, the campus has now completed a study of how to better serve part-time students. The resulting recommendations are currently under review by the campus.

It should be noted that compared to other major doctoral-granting universities, UMCP ranks relatively high in its emphasis on part-time graduate study (see Table 40). Emphasis on part-time graduate study depends, among other things, on location and program emphasis so all institutions are not strictly comparable. However, UMCP ranks highest among the institutions listed in Table 40 and has over twice the median proportion of part-time students among that group of schools. On the other hand, because of Maryland's small size and lack of public institutions with diverse graduate programs UMCP needs to

TABLE 38

TRENDS IN PART-TIME GRADUATE STUDENTS

	Fall 1975	Fall 1976	Fall 1977	Fall 1978	Fall 1979
UMAB					
Part-Time Grad Stu.	353	341	484	645	691
% Total Grad Stu.	32.9%	30.4%	39.3%	49.0%	51.0%
UMBC					
Part-Time Grad Stu.	90	149	230	303	269
% Total Grad Stu.	48.9%	61.8%	72.8%	76.5%	69.3%
UMCP					
Part-Time Grad Stu.	4473	4877	4969	4920	4776
% Total Grad Stu.	61.0%	63.8%	64.1%	65.7%	64.9%
UMES					
Part-Time Grad Stu.	N/A	N/A	N/A	33	38
% Total Grad Stu.	N/A	N/A	N/A	91.7%	79.2%
UMUC					
Part-Time Grad Stu.	N/A	N/A	234	384	562
% Total Grad Stu.	N/A	N/A	100%	96.2%	94.8%

TABLE 39

GRADUATE CREDIT HOURS OFFERED AFTER 5 P.M.

	Fall 1975	Fall 1976	Fall 1977	Fall 1978	Fall 1979
UMAB*					
On-Campus					
Number		0	0	0	0
% Total Grad Hrs**		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Off-Campus					
Number		0	0	0	0
% Total Grad Hrs		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
UMBC					
On-Campus					
Number		513	492	603	792
% Total Grad Hrs		33.3%	29.7%	45.5%	45.5%
Off-Campus					
Number		0	0	0	0
% Total Grad Hrs		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
UMCP					
On-Campus					
Number		8414	8133	8705	7243
% Total Grad Hrs		24.9%	22.9%	26.2%	21.6%
Off-Campus					
Number		0	0	72	150
% Total Grad Hrs		0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.4%
UMES					
On-Campus					
Number	N/A	N/A	N/A	87	240
% Total Grad Hrs				100%	100%
Off-Campus					
Number	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0
% Total Grad Hrs				0.0%	0.0%

TABLE 40

PART-TIME GRADUATE ENROLLMENTS AS A PERCENTAGE
OF TOTAL GRADUATE ENROLLMENTS
FALL, 1978

	Part-Time	%	Total
Univ of Cal-Berkeley	530	6.5%	8200
Univ of Cal-Los Angeles	634	7.9%	7975
Univ of Florida	1299	31.4%	4143
Florida St. Univ	1214	40.7%	3474
Univ of Iu-Urbana	2089	29.4%	7107
Univ of Iowa	3497	53.8%	6495
Univ of Mass-Amherst	2130	50.6%	4212
Michigan St. Univ	5924	61.7%	9601
Univ Mich-Ann Arbor	3977	36.4%	10919
SUNY-Albany	1592	48.9%	3256
SUNY-Stony Brook	1822	49.6%	3670
Univ of N.C.-Chapel Hill	1370	34.3%	3995
Ohio St. Univ-Main	3816	40.0%	9534
Univ of Oregon-Main	706	23.1%	3060
Penn St. Univ-Main	1057	23.6%	4484
Univ of Texas-Austin	1376	17.6%	7819
Univ of Va-Main	967	26.4%	3668
Univ of Washington	2206	29.2%	7566
Univ of Wisconsin-Madison	1959	21.8%	8969
Median		31.4%	
UMCP	4920	65.7%	7483

assume the major role in the State for part-time evening graduate education when such programs are not available.

Like UMCP, the other campuses of the University of Maryland have relatively large part-time graduate enrollments. UMBC and UMES also have high proportions of evening enrollments. UMAB, however, reports no evening credit hours at the graduate level.

Each campus of the University should continue to annually provide information about significant activities designed to increase access for persons desiring to pursue part-time and/or evening graduate study.

PROGRAMS AT FEDERAL INSTALLATIONS

The Plan recommends that SBHE serve as an information clearinghouse to facilitate provision of education programs to meet the needs of students on Federal installations.

Status

During 1980, SBHE continued to focus upon provision of quality educational services to military personnel. In addition to strengthening and expanding relationships between educational and military representatives, the SBHE hosted a two-day Military Education Seminar. The seminar, which focused upon quality in off-campus education, attracted nearly one hundred representatives from military services, base education officers, higher education institutions in Maryland and out-of-state, other state coordinating agencies, the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA), American Council on Education (ACE), Servicemens Opportunity College (SOC) and SBHE staff. A combination of panel discussion and formal presentations provided the opportunity for open exchange on the issues surrounding quality control.

During the coming year, SBHE will sponsor a followup meeting. In addition, the clearinghouse will be extended to other Federal installations.

PROGRAMS FOR REGISTERED NURSES

The Plan recommends that public colleges and universities offering baccalaureate programs in nursing ensure their programs adequately serve registered nurses desiring to complete bachelors degrees.

Status

All public institutions offering bachelors programs in nursing have now made provisions for serving registered nurses seeking the baccalaureate.

Assessment

This development is significant because of the increasing emphasis being placed on bachelors-level education for nurses and the need to provide access to such programs for registered nurses who have graduated from community colleges. While no further action is required at this time, each public four-year institution should provide in its annual planning report the number of full-time and part-time registered nurses enrolled in its bachelors program during the most recent fall semester. This information will provide a measure of the extent to which the needs of registered nurses are being met.

UTILIZING INTERSTATE COMPACTS AND THE SREB ACADEMIC COMMON MARKET

The Statewide Plan provides that Maryland, to the extent possible, take advantage of programs available through interstate contractual arrangements and the Academic Common Market of the SREB; and that the SBHE take into account programs available through such arrangements in reviewing proposals for new programs.

No academic programs were proposed by Maryland institutions during the past year which were available through interstate arrangements. However, a change was made in Maryland's interstate contractual arrangements for veterinary medical education.

The State has historically provided its citizens with opportunities for veterinary medical education through contractual arrangements. Under this system, Maryland negotiates each year for the number of spaces and the fees for these spaces. Most of Maryland's contracts have been with schools in states which are members of the Southern Region Education Board (SREB). Under this program, the SREB determines the schools which Maryland residents can attend and the fees to be charged. Until recently, Maryland's spaces had been at the University of Georgia. In recent years, the SREB has been eliminating Maryland's spaces at the University of Georgia and substituting spaces at Tuskegee Institute and the University of Florida. For Fall 1979, Maryland had contracts for 24 entering

spaces at SREB schools (Georgia - 2, Tuskegee - 7, Florida - 15). In addition, Maryland has contracts with Ohio State University, Cornell University, and the University of Pennsylvania. The number and costs of these spaces are negotiated directly with the institution. For Fall 1979, the State had contracts for 5 entering spaces at each of these schools.

The issue of whether Maryland should develop its own veterinary school has received a good deal of attention in recent years. Both the University of Maryland and The Johns Hopkins University have carried out studies of this issue. In addition, the 1978 Maryland General Assembly passed a resolution requesting the Commissioner of Higher Education to appoint a task force to study the need for a school of veterinary medicine in the State. The Statewide Plan also provided for the study to be undertaken. The resulting study was published in April, 1979.

The major recommendations of the task force were that the State consider establishment of a cooperative school of veterinary medicine with Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (VPI and SU) and the establishment of a clinical teaching facility in Maryland as part of this arrangement. Under this proposal, Maryland would contract with VPI and SU for student spaces. Maryland also would consider establishing a facility for: (1) providing a limited number of students with clinical training during their fourth year of study; (2) carrying out research; and (3) providing public service, referral, and continuing education programs. Unlike other contractual arrangements, the proposal provided for Maryland to participate in the policy-making processes of the school. In addition, the proposal would consolidate contracts with three SREB schools into a single arrangement and thereby simplify the preparations required by students for admission.

The State Board for Higher Education in its FY 1980 budget submission to the Governor requested that contracts formerly held with the SREB be transferred to VPI and SU. The Board took no action on the rest of the proposal of the Task Force.

On February 14, 1980, the Governor of Maryland signed an agreement with the Governor of Virginia for 24 entering spaces for Maryland residents for the 1980-81 and 1981-82 academic years and 30 entering spaces for each year thereafter. The agreement also provides for the University of Maryland to have responsibilities for Maryland's role in the arrangement. These responsibilities include academic policy setting, cost review, and program evaluation.

FUNDS FOR QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS

The Plan provides that the SBHE support institutional budget requests for specific quality improvements and innovative programs.

Status

The SBHE requested that in the budget submissions of institutions all funds for quality improvements be specifically identified. In the FY 1981 budget, the SBHE recommended $2.3 million specifically for quality improvements. This included $1.1 million at the University of Maryland for a special fund to recruit and retain outstanding faculty. The Legislature appropriated $600,000 for this purpose. Additional quality improvements included funds to purchase new equipment as well as additional operating funds at most institutions.

The SBHE will continue to ask institutions to identify funds earmarked for quality improvement in the budget and pre-MARC requests. The SBHE will continue to support such requests based on their merit.

PROGRAMS FOR HIGH ABILITY STUDENTS

The Statewide Plan provides for all public four-year institutions to develop or improve programs designed to attract high ability students.

University of Maryland

The UMCP campus has had a large honors program for a number of years. It currently has about 1,000 students enrolled. The average combined SAT scores of students enrolled in this program is 1,200 (compared to 960 for the entering freshman class).

During the fall of 1979, UMCP enrolled 32 National Merit Scholars, an increase from 16 in 1978 and from 7 in 1977. Five National Achievement Scholars were enrolled in 1979 (3 were enrolled in 1978 and 2 in 1977). In the first year of operation, 38 of the 100 scholarship recipients in the State's Distinguished Scholars Program enrolled at UMCP. In addition, UMCP makes merit aid available through a number of privately-supported programs. In 1979, 15 Chancellor's Scholarships were awarded averaging $500 each (up from 13 @$500 in 1978 and 11 @$500 in 1977) and the Banneker Scholarship for

minority students was initiated (15 awards averaging $1,067).

UMES initiated a joint honors program with UMAB during the fall of 1979. The program is designed to provide assured admission to the UMAB professional schools for students successfully completing the program. In the fall of 1979, the program enrolled 31 freshmen. Twenty-one of these students were black and 14 were female. Forty freshmen are projected for fall 1980. Admission to the program requires a combined SAT score of at least 1100 (compared to an average combined SAT of 676 for the entire freshman class in 1979). Students enrolled in the program in 1979 received financial aid either through the Macy Foundation (17) or through the institution (14).

UMBC does not currently have an honors program but is in the process of planning one. The campus, however, does provide merit-based financial aid to selected students. In fall 1979, 20 Chancellor's Scholarships were awarded, 28 students received Scholastic Achievement Awards, and 6 students received grants under the State's Distinguished Scholars Program.

St. Mary's

St. Mary's began its honors program in the fall of 1979. The program provides for freshman and sophomore students in the program to take special honors courses and permits them to take upper division courses. Juniors and seniors in the program may participate in independent study, internships, and/or study abroad. Seniors enroll in a research seminar and write a thesis. Seniors are required to take comprehensive examinations in their major fields of study and to orally defend their theses before a faculty committee.

In the fall of 1979, the first year of its program, St. Mary's enrolled 22 entering students. The combined SAT scores for these students averaged 1169 and their high school GPA's averaged 3.57 (compared to a combined SAT of 949 and high school GPA of 2.79 for the entire freshman class). Ten of the students were on State-funded scholarships. Five others received aid through privately supported fellowships.

Morgan

Morgan has had a general honors program for a number of years. Freshman admission to the program requires a student to achieve a combined SAT of at least 900. Students in the program receive financial aid through Regents Scholarships and State-funded High Ability and Departmental Honors Scholarships.

The Honors Program has not had a full-time director in the past but will have one beginning in the fall of 1980. The institution is currently reviewing the program to determine how it can be improved and expanded. This evaluation is being supported by a Federal grant and will be completed by the end of the 1980-81 academic year.

State Colleges and Universities

The 1979-80 academic year was a year for planning institution-wide Honors Programs at the State Universities and Colleges. One hundred forty-seven faculty were involved in serving on Honors planning committees, teaching Honors courses and advising students in Honors research activities. Two hundred fourteen students were admitted to Honors programs. As plans were developed on each campus students were enrolled in the program and selected faculty were assigned Honors sections to teach or to work with advisees who were pursuing special projects.

The Board of Trustees, from an appropriation of $50,000, funded projects at five of the segment institutions which provided assistance in planning, materials development (including handbooks, brochures, etc.), student research grants, and related activities.

A Board staff member chaired the Segment Honors Committee that gave leadership to planning on each campus and an Honors Program Workshop for directors and faculty. From interest in the workshop and the desire to share information with representatives from other institutions steps were taken to form the Maryland Collegiate Honors Council.

During the FY 1979-1980, Bowie initiated the "Honors College" with 25 students enrolled. In previous years students have had Honors course opporutunities at the department level. To be eligible for admission to the "Honors College" a student must have a combined SAT score of 1000, have a 3.00 High School G.P.A. and two letters of recommendation from high school teachers. In addition to attendance in Honors classes the students are required to work independently on an Honors project/thesis and complete an assignment of readings. The Bowie Honors students have published the first issue of a campus Honors newsletter.

At Coppin, twelve students were enrolled during FY 1979-80 in the general studies Honors program. The college has both a general studies Honors program and a Departmental Honors component. Plans call for the implementation of an

interdisciplinary Honors seminar at the junior class level for all students admitted to the program. An Honors Center is being developed. Outside funding is being sought to provide for twenty "no need" scholarships. To be admitted to the program at Coppin an applicant must meet two of six criteria which include SAT-V score, SAT-M score, combined SAT score, Nelson Denny Reading Test score, High School Grade Average in an accelerated college preparatory program and grade point average for college credit earned in credit-in escrow program.

FY 1979-80 was a year of Honors Program planning at Frostburg. Plans for an institution-wide program will be implemented in FY 1980-81. Departmental Honors have been offered for several years. Twelve students were enrolled in FY 1979-80 in departmental Honors sections. As a part of the planning activity surveys were completed by 100 eligible students. Nineteen faculty are preparing instructional materials for Fall 1980 course implementation. Students admitted to the program are expected to have a combined SAT score of 1100, a high school G.P.A. of 3.50 and be in the top ten percent of their graduating class.

At Salisbury State College FY 1979-80 was a an Honors Program Planning year. Plans were developed and a portion of the program was implemented with 24 Honors students enrolled in "Honors Option" courses. Recruitment efforts for the Fall 1980 promise an enrollment of 30 students. To be admitted to the program at Salisbury a student must have a combined SAT score of 1000 and a high school G.P.A. of 3.25 in academic subjects.

Towson State University has provided Departmental Honors opportunities for a number of years. One hundred thirteen students participated in departmental Honors programs in FY 1979-80. Twelve students received Honors research grants, and 16 Presidential Scholars received $770 each in scholarship aid from the University Foundations. Honors theses are being published in a thesis booklet and an Art Honors Catalog. The "Honors College" concept is being explored by faculty committees. Admission to Honors courses at Towson requires a combined SAT score of 1300.

As an upper division institution, the University of Baltimore admits students to the Honors program if they have a College G.P.A. of 3.50. During FY 1979-80, 28 students participated in the Great Books Colloquium and/or completed Honors research projects. Three students received scholarships that were made available from a special award from BTSUC as part of the Honors Program. An integrated Honors program that involves all departments is being planned. In addition, the University of Baltimore's Educational Foundation awarded 214 fellowships (ranging from $350 to $800 a year) to students with

a 3.0 average or better. The University also awarded (through the Foundation) 54 graduate fellowships on a competitive basis, averaging $3,000 per year.

Assessment

There appears to be grounds for optimism that Maryland public institutions will be able to make progress in attracting increasing numbers of high ability students. As indicated above all institutions are making efforts to attract high ability students through special programs and/or financial aid.

On a statewide basis, the indicators of the extent to which efforts in attracting high ability students are meeting with success are mixed. A review of the data, however, is useful in establishing baselines against which progress can be measured in the future.

High School Seniors

In the spring of 1979, the annual high school senior followup study carried out by the State Department of Education indicated that 47% of the "A" students who intended to enroll in college within one year of graduating intended to enroll in out-of-state institutions. This is about the same as the previous year (46%). The number of "B" students intending to leave the State remained the same both years - 27%. The data for Spring 1980 graduates are not yet available.

Another indicator from the high school followup survey is student high school grade average (self-reported). Table 41 shows the distribution of grades reported by Maryland high school seniors in Spring 1978 who enrolled in Maryland public institutions in fall 1978. Future SBHE studies will monitor the grade distributions of Maryland high school students entering public four-year institutions.

Enrollment of National Merit Scholars and National Achievement Semifinalists

Maryland institutions as a group enrolled 111 National Merit Scholars in Fall, 1979. This was an increase from 78 in 1978. Most of the increase occurred at the Johns Hopkins University (from 48 to 65) and at UMCP (from 16 to 32). Despite this increase, Maryland institutions as a group enrolled only 38% of the number that would be expected based on the production of National Merit Scholars by Maryland high schools.

TABLE 41

SELF-REPORTED HIGH SCHOOL GRADE AVERAGES
OF ENTERING FRESHMEN

	Grade Average				
	A	B	C	D	TOTAL
Statewide - All Maryland Public High School Seniors - Class of 1978	9.8%	42.7%	44.6%	2.9%	100%
Maryland Public High School Seniors (Class of 1978) Enrolled in Fall 1978 As Entering Freshmen					
Bowie	0.7%	37.6%	61.7%	0.0%	100%
Coppin	2.2%	39.1%	55.4%	3.3%	100%
Frostburg	13.4%	65.4%	21.2%	0.0%	100%
Morgan	2.3%	40.5%	55.8%	4.7%	100%
Salisbury	11.2%	65.8%	22.7%	0.3%	100%
St. Mary's	17.0%	60.3%	22.7%	0.0%	100%
Towson	19.0%	66.1%	14.8%	1.2%	100%
UMBC	18.8%	64.6%	16.6%	0.0%	100%
UMCP	23.7%	60.7%	15.3%	0.2%	100%
UMES	Did Not Report Data				

National Achievement Scholars are high achieving black students. In 1979, Maryland institutions enrolled a total of 30 National Achievement Scholars. Of these, 22 were enrolled at the Johns Hopkins University, 5 were enrolled at UMCP, 2 were enrolled at UMBC, and 1 at Columbia Union. The previous year 29 were enrolled. The 1979 total represented 39% of the number that would be expected based on the number graduating from Maryland high schools.

SBHE Survey of Semifinalists

In the Spring of 1979, SBHE began an annual survey of high school seniors who were semifinalists in the National Merit and National Achievement competition. The purpose of this survey is to continually monitor the college-attendance plans of the State's top high school students as well as to gain information about factors influencing their educational decisions.

The Spring 1979 survey indicated that 83% of the Semifinalists who had chosen a college were going to an out-of-State institution. Preliminary results from the 1980 survey indicated that 75% of the Semifinalists who had chosen an institution were leaving the State. Future surveys will reveal whether the decrease in students going out-of-State between 1979 and 1980 is the beginning of a trend.

The most important factor in college choice cited by students going out of State was institutional reputation. This reason was ranked only tenth by students electing a Maryland public institution. Having a quality program in the students' major was the second most important reason cited by students staying in-State as well as those going out of State. Institutional contacts were cited as very important in influencing students to leave the State while they were not particularly influential for those staying in State. Low tuition was the most important factor influencing students to attend a public institution in State but was not influential in decisions to go out of State. Financial assistance was also an important factor influencing students to attend an in-State public institution but was not cited as particularly influential in decisions to attend out-of-State institutions. Students going out-of-State cited the following improvements that Maryland public institutions could make to make them more attractive: (in order) improve their academic reputations, become more selective in admissions, reduce the size of UMCP, improve honors programs, and increase merit-based financial aid.

This survey will continue to be carried out each spring in order to monitor progress in attracting these students and to

evaluate the factors important in making college decisions.

Maryland Distinguished Scholarship Recipients

The 1978 Maryland General Assembly established the Distinguished Scholar Program. This program, administered by the Maryland State Scholarship Board, was implemented beginning with the 1979-80 academic year. The program provides 100 renewable scholarships of $500 each for freshmen enrolling in Maryland institutions. The State Scholarship Board has published the results of its study of the first year of the program's operation. Of the group of students originally offered awards under this program, 51.5% decided to attend an out-of-State institution rather than accept the award. This figure is consistent with the results for "A" students from the High School Followup Study cited above. Of the students who did accept awards, they attended the institution indicated in Table 42.

For comparison the percentage of new full-time Maryland freshmen that each of these institutions enrolled is also shown. UMCP, Johns Hopkins, Loyola, and Western Maryland enrolled much larger percentages of distinguished scholars than their shares of freshman enrollments. Other institutions enrolled recipients to about the same or lesser extent as their shares of freshman enrollments. The reasons cited by students who selected out-of-State institutions included the need for enhancing the academic reputations of Maryland institutions and the need for more merit-based financial aid. UMCP was also perceived as being too large. These are consistent with the findings of the SBHE survey of Semifinalists.

The 1980 Maryland General Assembly passed S.B. 598, Governor Hughes' administration bill, which increased the number of scholarships to entering students to 300 and increased the amount of each to $800. The results of this program will continue to be reported in the annual reviews of the Statewide Plans.

PROGRAMS AND COURSES AT OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS

The Statewide Plan requires that new off-campus programs be submitted to SBHE for review; and provides for the collection and publication of data for off-campus programs offered each academic session, as well as the submission of a copy of all promotional materials for such courses provided to the public, in order to monitor off-campus offerings.

TABLE 42

INSTITUTIONS SELECTED BY RECIPIENTS OF
DISTINGUISHED SCHOLARSHIPS
FALL 1979

	No.	%	% Of Statewide Full-Time Freshman Enrollments (Maryland Residents)
UMCP	37	37%	17.5%
Johns Hopkins	19	19%	0.6%
Loyola	14	14%	2.5%
UMBC	6	6%	5.5%
Western Maryland	6	6%	1.2%
Towson	5	5%	8.4%
Frostburg	2	2%	2.9%
Washington Coll.	2	2%	0.5%
St. Mary's	1	1%	1.4%
Mt. St. Mary's	1	1%	0.7%
Notre Dame	1	1%	0.5%
Columbia Union	1	1%	0.3%
Anne Arundel	1	1%	4.3%
Catonsville	1	1%	3.9%
Garrett	1	1%	0.7%
Montgomery	1	1%	8.5%
Other	0	0%	38.9%
TOTAL	100	100%	

Status

Beginning with the Spring, 1979 term, the SBHE began collecting these data from all in-State and out-of-state institutions operating in Maryland.

Two types of information are collected. The first, general information and program data, have been collected and are updated by institutions annually for each off-campus site. The second, a listing of courses and course-related information, is collected for the previous fall and spring semesters.

Results of the Spring, 1979 data collection show that off-campus courses and/or programs were offered by most public institutions and seven independent institutions. Institutions reported offerings at 190 sites and over 30,000 enrollments (not unduplicated).

DOCTORAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

The Plan provides that future doctoral program development be limited to institutions currently offering the doctorate and to Morgan State University, which may develop doctoral programs having a distinct urban focus and meeting clearly identified urban needs. Development of cooperative programs between doctoral centers and institutions not granting the doctorate is encouraged in order to ensure an adequate level of access and to maintain quality. Development of doctoral proposals by other institutions is not encouraged. However, proposals for doctoral programs from other institutions will be considered by SBHE and may be approved or receive a positive recommendation in exceptional circumstances when such a program clearly would be unique within the State and would meet a high priority need.

Status

The SBHE did not approve or endorse any proposals for doctoral programs at other than doctoral-granting institutions during the past year.

CERTIFICATES OF ADVANCED STUDY

The Plan provides that programs leading to certificates of advanced study be offered by institutions in fields in which they award the doctorate. New programs leading to certificates of advanced study also may be offered by institutions which

award only the masters degree, providing that such programs are offered in cooperation with a doctoral-granting institution and that courses taken in such a program can be credited toward a doctoral degree at the cooperating doctoral-granting institution in the event that a student desires to complete work on a doctorate.

Status

The SBHE did not approve or endorse any proposals for certificates of advanced study during this past year.

DEVELOPMENT OF NEW PROGRAMS

The Plan lists policies which the SBHE will follow when reviewing proposals for new programs. A program proposal manual has been drafted and has been reviewed by the segments. The Board will act on the manual in the near future.

Table 43 indicates those programs approved and endorsed from July 1979 through June 1980. In addition, the Board also reviewed a number of requests to discontinue programs. Those that were approved or endorsed by SBHE for discontinuance are listed in Table 44.

CHARGEBACK ARRANGEMENTS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The Plan supports establishing chargeback arrangements for regional and statewide programs designated by the State Board for Community Colleges. These arrangements provide for out-of-county students to be reimbursed for the nonresident tuition differential when enrolled in a designated program. The purpose of this program is to maximize access to specialized programs while at the same time minimizing the need for duplicate programs.

Status

Below is a summary of the extent to which the SBCC has been able to reimburse students in regional and statewide programs for the out-of-county tuition differential they have been charged.

TABLE 43

NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAMS APPROVED OR ENDORSED
FROM JULY 1, 1979 TO JUNE, 1980

Institution	Program Area	Degree	Implementation
July			
UMBC/UMCP	Applied Develop. Psy.	Ph.D.	Fall, 1980
UMBC	Info. and Computer Systems Mgmt (transfer of Info. Systems Mgmt from UMCP)	B.S.	Fall, 1979
September			
Bowie	Administrative Mgmt - Options in Public Admin. and Business Administration	M.A.	Fall, 1979
Bowie	Nursing	B.S.	Fall, 1979
UMAB-Dental Sch	Oral Biology	M.S.	Fall, 1979
UMCP	Business and Mgmt	M.S.	Fall, 1979
Hood College	Law and Society	B.A.	Fall, 1979
Hood College	Social Work	B.A.	Fall, 1979
November			
UMCP	Architecture (Restructuring of Existing Program)	B.S.,	Spring, 1980
UMES/UMCP	Agriculture and Extension Education	M.S.	Spring, 1980
UMES	Computer Science/ Data Processing	B.S.	Spring, 1980
February			
Allegany C.C.	Respiratory Therapy Technician	A.A.	Fall, 1980
Cecil C.C.	Data Processing	A.A./ Cert.	Fall, 1980
Cecil C.C.	Sanitary Technology	Cert.	Fall, 1980
Harford C.C.	Electrodiagnostic Technology	A.A.	Fall, 1980
Mont-Rockville	Handicapped Assistance	Cert.	Fall, 1980
Mont-Takoma Pk	Legal Assistant	Cert.	Fall, 1980
Bowie	Administrative Mgmt - Full Program Approval and Degree Authorization	M.A.	Spring, 1980
Hood College	Biochemistry	B.A.	Fall, 1980
Hood College	Psychobiology	B.A.	Fall, 1980

TABLE 43 (Cont'd)

NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAMS APPROVED OR ENDORSED
FROM JULY 1, 1979 TO JUNE, 1980

April			
Essex C.C.	Radiation Therapy	A.A.	Fall, 1980
Harford C.C.	Business Management	A.A.	Fall, 1980
Howard C.C.	Interpreter Education (For Hearing Impaired)	A.A.	Fall, 1980
Univ. of Balt.	Legal Studies	M.A.	Summer, 1980
St. Mary's College of Md.	Dramatic Arts	B.A.	Fall, 1980
UMAB/UMBC	Emergency Medical Serv.	B.S.	Fall, 1980
UMES	Physical Therapy	B.S.	Fall, 1980
Goucher	Art Therapy	M.A.	Fall, 1980
Goucher	Historic Preservation	M.A.	Fall, 1980
Johns Hopkins	Counseling (Education and Psychology Emphasis)	Ed.D.	Summer, 1980
St. John's Col.	Liberal Education	M.A.	Summer, 1980
Villa Julie	Activity Therapy Tech. For The Older Adult	A.A.	Fall, 1980
June			
Charles Co. C.C.	Establishing Satellite Com. Coll. Center(s) in Calvert County		Fall, 1980
Dundalk C.C.	Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning	A.A./ Cert.	Fall, 1980
Morgan S.U.	Telecommunications	B.S./ B.A.	Fall, 1980
Towson S.U.	Redesignation of BS/BA in Business Admin. to Acctng. and Bus. Admin.	B.S./ B.A.	Fall, 1980
Loyola College	Extending Existing MBA to Off-Campus Site at Hunt Valley	M.B.A.	Fall, 1980

TABLE 44

PROGRAMS APPROVED FOR DISCONTINUANCE

Institution	Program Area	Degree	Eff. Date
November			
Mt. St. Mary's	Social Welfare	B.A.	Spring 1980
April			
Allegany C.C.	Chem. Technology	Cert.	Summer 1980
Chas Co. C.C.	Surveying	Cert.	Summer 1980
Mont-Rockville	Instructional Aide	Cert.	Summer 1980
Pr. Geo's C.C.	Fire Science Tech.	A.A.	Summer 1980
UMCP	Crafts Curriculum	B.S.	Fall 1980
UMCP	Costume Curriculum	B.S.	Fall 1980
June			
Catonsville C.C.	Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning Technology	AA/Cert	Summer 1980

Fiscal Year	Total Funds	% of Differential Reimbursed to Students
1978	$13,296	54%
1979	29,204	53%
1980	55,000	68%

FY 1980 was the first year in which State General Funds were appropriated for the program. The result was an increase in the percentage of the tuition differential that could be reimbursed to the students participating. Table 45 shows the programs and the numbers of FTEs generated in FY 1980. For FY 1981, $55,000 has been appropriated. However, no funds have been included in the SBCC's FY 1982 MARC.

Table 46 indicates those programs currently designated by SBCC as regional or statewide and therefore eligible for reimbursement under the program.

Action

SBHE WILL CONTINUE TO SUPPORT SBCC REQUESTS FOR FUNDING FOR THE PROGRAM.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AT BOWIE, UMES, AND UMBC

The Plan recommends increased emphasis on program development at Bowie, UMES, and UMBC in order to increase their attractiveness and thereby improve their enrollment prospects.

Status

Twenty-five programs were approved or endorsed by SBHE between July 1978 and June 1979. Of these 9 (36%) were at one of these campuses. Seven of these involved UMES and one each was approved at Bowie and UMBC.

From July 1979 through June 1980, 38 programs were approved or endorsed by SBHE. Nine (24%) of these involved one of these three campuses. Three programs were approved at each of the campuses.

One of the specific recommendations of the Plan that has not yet been implemented was for the University of Baltimore to establish a branch of its law school at the Bowie campus to serve part-time students. The Board of Trustees of the State

TABLE 45

STATEWIDE AND REGIONAL PROGRAMS
FUNDING FOR FY 1980

	Number Of FTE Students
Allegany	
Forest Technology	16.63
Community College of Baltimore	
Dental Hygiene	28.63
Respiratory Therapy	6.33
Physical Therapy	5.93
Catonsville	
Air Transportation	26.20
Mortuary Science	33.07
Cecil	
Photography	.80
Dundalk	
Stationary Engineering	4.47
Retail Florestry	8.60
Labor Studies	1.73
Garrett	
Wildlife Management Technology	22.63
Howard	
Vision Care	6.57
Biomedical Engineering Technology	3.83
Wor-Wic Tech	
Hotel, Motel, Restaurant Management	1.40
Total	166.82

TABLE 46

REGIONAL AND STATEWIDE PROGRAMS - FY 1981

Allegany Community College
- Dental Hygiene (S)
- Forest Technology (S)

Community College of Baltimore
- Dental Hygiene (S)
- International Trade/Harbor Management (R)
- Physical Therapy Assistant (R)
- Respiratory Therapy (R)

Catonsville Community College
- Air Transportation Management (R)
- Mortuary Science (S)

Cecil Community College
- Professional Photography (R)

Dundalk Community College
- Labor Studies (R)
- Power Engineering Technology (R)
- Retail Floristry (R)

Garrett Community College
- Veterinary Science Technology (R)
- Wildlife Management (S)

Howard Community College
- Biomedical Engineering Technology (R)
- Vision Care Technology (R)

Wor-Wic Tech Community College
- Hotel-Motel Management (R)
- Nursing, Practical (R)
- Nursing, Registered (R)

Universities and Colleges began planning for implementing this recommendation. BTSUC reports that the American Bar Association advised that the University of Baltimore Law School could not be granted full accreditation if the branch were established prior to its receipt of that accreditation. BTSUC reports that a review of needs and costs will again take place following full accreditation of the University, which is expected in the near future.

DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAMS

The Plan provides for the SBHE to complete by July 1980 a study of developmental programs in Maryland public institutions.

Status

As of this date, the staff has presented a draft report to the Institutional Approval and Program Committee. A revised draft will be presented to the Board in the near future.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The Plan provides for the SBHE to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of education programs in the State.

Status

In cooperation with the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), the SBHE has developed a process for conducting an assessment of education programs based on existing and projected needs for educational personnel. A task force composed of segmental and institutional representatives was formed to advise on the study. The projected review process will employ and extend Middle States, MCATE and MSDE data as well as student followup data currently collected by institutions. In addition, the study will focus on student outcomes.

The study will review existing programs using four criteria: need for program graduates, program productivity, cost, and indications of potential program quality. These criteria will be considered in light of the ove.all program orientation and mission of the total institution. The major steps in the review process are:

1. Identification of Programs

Step one requires the identification of the degree programs and program tracks to be included in the review process. Discipline specialties in education (HEGIS 0800) and program tracks in Arts and Sciences leading to MSDE certification will be included.

An inventory has been developed to identify each program or program track by level by institution. This inventory has been verified with the institutions and with MSDE.

2. Development of Materials

Step two requires the development of survey materials needed to gather basic information on each program. These data will supplement those available from MSDE and other sources. This has been accomplished.

3. Field Test and Refinement

Materials have been field tested and refined with members of the Advisory Group. This step ensures that the data requested are available and that the request does not duplicate existing reports.

4. Orientation

Step four requires SBHE staff to meet with those individuals at institutions designated as review coordinators. The orientation will provide an opportunity for discussion with interested faculty of the purposes and procedures of the review process. It will also provide for clarification of the survey materials for representatives of each program unit. This has been completed.

5. Data Collection

Step five involves the collection of basic data regarding curriculum, students, faculty, administration and resources. It also involves the review of MSDE, NCATE, and self-evaluations and the verification of data compiled by SBHE and MSDE. SBHE and segmental staff will coordinate this step with institutional review coordinators. This process is currently underway.

6. Program Presentations

In step six institutions will be given the opportunity to meet with SBHE staff and Advisory Group members to

discuss the total education program at their institution. It will afford the opportunity for institutions to provide additional information not requested by the survey materials and to discuss future plans.

7. Program Profiles

In step seven SBHE staff, with the assistance of the Advisory Group, will develop a descriptive profile of each program included in the review process. This profile will incorporate information from the survey materials, results of external and internal evaluations, and the program presentations.

8. Analysis of Data

In step eight program profiles and supplemental data will be analyzed by SBHE, Advisory Committee members, and general consultants to the review process. It is anticipated this step will result in a series of qustions to be addressed by each program.

9. Institutional Response

Step nine requires that the institution respond to the questions and comment upon the program profile. This step gives the institution the opportunity to provide additional information and correct any inaccuracies.

10. Identification of Selected Programs

Based upon the analyses of available data and the institutional response discussed above SBHE staff, Advisory Group members and external consultants will identify programs which require further review. These decisions will be based upon an analyses of each program using the four review criteria: demand, cost, productivity and quality.

11. Review of Selected Programs

In step eleven selected programs will be further reviewed. This review may include the use of external consultants who will work with the staff and the advisory group. Informal visits may be conducted for discussions with students, administrators and faculty. In addition, institutions may be asked to provide additional information or to clarify previously presented information.

12. Recommendations and Report

The review process will conclude with presentation of recommendations to the institutions and a report of the full review process to the State Board for Higher Education.

It is expected that the process through the development of program profiles will be completed by Fall of 1980. The second phase of the process will be completed by Summer of 1981.

INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

The Statewide Plan provides that the Education Coordinating Committee (ECC) develop a plan for in-service teacher education in the State.

Status

The Education Coordinating Committee (ECC) in September 1978 created a task force to develop the plan. The Task Force submitted its report, "A Maryland Plan for the Continuing Professional Development of Local School System Personnel," to the ECC in July, 1979. The Department of Education requested $2.9 million in the FY 1981 budget to implement provisions of the Plan. This request, however, was not included in the Governor's Budget. In March, 1980 the State Board of Education approved modifications of several recommendations in the Plan, primarily those affecting representation on State and local advisory bodies to be discussed by the ECC.

Assessment

The need for an effective statewide in-service education program for local school personnel remains a high priority for the coming decade. The Task Force Plan provides a basis for developing such a program. Early agreement on the specifics of the Plan between the Department of Education and the State Board for Higher Education is needed to obtain necessary funding and to implement an effective program.

Action

THE SBHE, THROUGH THE ECC, WILL SEEK AN EARLY AGREEMENT WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ON THE PROVISIONS OF THE "PLAN FOR CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF LOCAL SCHOOL PERSONNEL" AND SUPPORT A BUDGET REQUEST FOR FY 1982 IN ORDER TO IMPLEMENT THE PLAN.

CONTINUING EDUCATION

Status

During FY 1979, a study (Federally funded under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965) was initiated to collect data on non-credit continuing education activities offered by public and independent collegiate institutions in Maryland. Data were collected on the type of activities conducted, contact hours, cost to participants, Fall 1978 enrollments, sources of funding and location of course offering (on or off campus).

During the period July, 1978 to June, 1979 Maryland colleges and universities offered an estimated total of 8,330 continuing education activities. Enrollments in these activities are estimated to be 225,588.

When analyzed by source of funds, it was found most activities are supported by student fees (42%). Approximately 29% are State supported and 24% funded by combined student and State monies.

By subject matter category, the three largest categories were business, health care and health services, and home economics.

SBHE has received Federal Title I funds to continue the study and has contracted for a survey of local education agencies and non-collegiate institutions to obtain comparable data. This phase will be completed by December 31, 1980.

VI. Finance

The Plan contains a variety of recommendations for financing postsecondary education. In addition to finance recommendations included in the 1978 Plan, two areas were examined this year which were identified in the 1979 Update: the relationship between foundations associated with public institutions of higher education and their respective institutions, and the collection of National Direct Student Loans by institutions.

The major initiative in the finance area during FY 1981 will be a review of the SBHE operating budget guidelines. The guidelines were originally developed in 1976. Since that time the SBHE and the institutions have gained much experience in their applicability. In addition, improvements and increased uniformity in institutional reporting of data and changing conditions in higher education make a review particularly appropriate at this time.

The SBHE staff, in consultation with the segments, has begun the process of revising the guidelines. It is anticipated that the Board will act on a new set of guidelines by February, 1981.

PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES/COLLEGES IN MARYLAND

The Joint Budget and Audit Committee of the Maryland General Assembly requested that the State Board for Higher Education conduct a study concerning the relationships between public institutions of Higher Education and their respective private foundations and make recommendations concerning the relationship. The SBHE issued its report and recommendations in September, 1979. The report was developed in consultation with a task force appointed by the SBHE with representatives from all the segments of higher education, the Department of Fiscal Services and the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning.

The report noted that there are currently 20 foundations associated with public institutions of higher education in Maryland. The primary activity of the foundations is fund raising in support of their respective institutions. In addition to fund raising, the foundations engage in a wide variety of activities including, in some instances, the provision of non-credit courses and seminars. The report found

that foundations serve a valuable role in support of public higher education. The task force concluded that a set of guidelines governing the relationship between institutions and their respective foundations would be useful. The report contained the following recommendations.

1. Each governing board should establish specific guidelines for its institutions concerning the relationship between the institutions and any foundations which have been created to enhance them. A recommended set of guidelines for the governing board to adopt follow.

a) No institution should accept any funds from its foundation(s) unless an annual audit of the foundation's fiscal affairs has been conducted by an independent certified public accountant which provides sufficient detail to allow the institution and governing boards to ascertain the purposes of expenditures including the assurance that funds are accounted for and used in accordance with donor instructions. In addition, the audit report should contain a management letter which specifically addresses the operating procedures of the foundation and recommends any corrective actions necessary to ensure fiscal propriety and efficiency.

b) No institution should accept any funds from its foundation(s) unless the foundation provides the institution with a detailed annual report of expenditures made to or on behalf of institutional employees which has been verified by the Foundation's independent audit.

c) No institution should accept any funds from its foundation(s) unless it utilizes generally accepted accounting principles and practices; these need not be those employed by the institution.

d) Institutions should encourage foundations with which they are associated to use the same fiscal year as the institution.

e) An annual report stating major activities, officers and employees of the foundation should be on file with the governing board and be available to the general public and other interested parties upon request.

2. Since the basic purpose of a foundation is the enhancement of the institution, a foundation should be able to engage in any activity considered legitimate for a private corporation which does not conflict with State/Federal laws, its articles of incorporation, any applicable donor instructions, or the role/mission of the institution. It is expected that the Governing Board and the institution will continually monitor their relationship

with their foundation to ensure compliance with the above limitations.

3. The Governing Board should develop and adopt specific regulations which deal with the relationship between the Governing Board, the institution and the foundation(s). In addition, these regulations should be further supported by written agreements which may be necessary to clearly delineate the structure of the relationship as well as stress the separate identities of institution and the foundation. These regulations and/or agreements should deal with the segmental and/or institutional procedures for acceptance of contributions from the foundations, the use and reimbursement by the foundation of institutional facilities, resources, and personnel, and the dual or supplemental employment of institutional employees by the foundation.

4. The Governing Boards should ensure that all additional costs incurred by an institution as a result of providing a service, resource, or facility to the foundation be properly reimbursed by the foundation.

5. To avoid possible confusion/misrepresentation to the general public, the Governing Board and the institution should ensure that all correspondence, solicitations, activities and advertisements concerning the foundation should be readily identified as being from the foundation.

6. The Governing Board should ensure that the institution does not use foundation funds for the purpose of circumventing State policies or rules and regulations by engaging in activities or making expenditures which have been denied the institution for other than purely financial reasons.

7. In addition to the above recommendations, the Governing Boards and institutions should adopt any other regulations, policies, or guidelines necessary to guarantee the foundation's responsiveness to institutional goals, objectives, role, mission, and needs.

8. A copy of the regulations promulgated by each Governing Board and a listing of all associated foundations shall be supplied to the SBHE along with changes as they are adopted in the future.

In addition to the above recommendations, the State Board for Higher Education's statute gives it the authority to approve all institutions of postsecondary education in Maryland. Therefore, a foundation may not offer postsecondary degree programs, courses for credit, non-credit courses, seminars or similar instruction without the approval of the State Board for Higher Education.

As a result of these guidelines, each institution and governing board has reviewed its current policies and practices relating to their foundation(s) and made the necessary changes to make them consistent with the SBHE guidelines. It is expected that a regular review of the relationships, policies and practices by the Governing Boards will occur to ensure compliance, improve credibility, and promote the valuable services provided by the foundations to the institutions.

COLLECTION OF NATIONAL DIRECT STUDENT LOANS BY INSTITUTIONS

The Update to the Statewide Plan indicated that the SBHE would establish a task force to analyze the default rate problem on the National Direct Student Loans.

Status

In recent years, the Federal government has become concerned about the high rate of default on the National Direct Student Loans. Data indicate that between 1977 and 1978 the overall default rate nationally increased from 16.9 percent to 17.7 percent; the number of NDSL's in default have increased from approximately 700,000 to 841,181; and the amount defaulted has gone from $600 million to $702.5 million. During this time the default rate at Maryland institutions decreased from 21.4 percent to 20.6 percent, the number of Maryland NDSL's in default increased from 12,140 to 12,639; and the amount defaulted has gone from $8,916,727 to $9,795,940.

Nationally, some schools have default rates which run as high as 90 percent. In Maryland, the default rates ranged from a low of one percent to a high of 68 percent in 1978. The overall level of default has led HEW to warn that Federal NDSL funds will be cut off from schools which are unable to reduce their default rates by 10 percent next year.

According to HEW, the problem is that the schools are unable to seek repayment of many of the loans because of inadequate management of the loan records by the schools. In addition, many schools fail to turn their loans over to the Office of Education for collection. As a result of HEW's assessment, in March 1979, the Secretary of HEW ordered the Office of Education to develop new regulations and standards to reduce NDSL default rates. In response, the Office of Education developed the following approaches: Technical assistance and training will be increased to improve institutions' management of their NDSL programs; the procedure for the assignment of loans in default for more than two years to the Federal Government will be simplified; and standards will be instituted

which if not met, will result in a cutoff of NDSL funds from the Federal Government. In addition, in June of 1979 the GSL-NDSL default rate formula was revised to rid calculations of inconsistancies.

In response to these problems in Maryland, the State Board for Higher Education convened an NDSL Task Force in January, 1980 chaired by Mr. James Loamer, Executive Director of the Maryland Higher Education Loan Corporation, and comprised of members representing the University of Maryland, the State Colleges and Universities, Morgan State University, St. Mary's College, the Independent Colleges and Universities and the Community Colleges. This task force provides a mechanism by which institutions can share their approaches to dealing with default problems with one another. The task force is working on resolutions of the problems of ensuring sufficient Federal capital contributions to continue the NDSL program, reducing the high default rates at many institutions, and methods for more efficient and economical collection of NDSL loans.

Action

THE TASK FORCE WILL CONTINUE TO MEET UNTIL THE DEFAULT RATE PROBLEM IN THE STATE IS SUBSTANTIALLY REDUCED.

TOTAL FUNDING LEVELS

The following recommendation is contained in the Plan.

> WITHIN FIVE YEARS ALL INSTITUTIONS SHOULD BE FUNDED AT 100 PERCENT OF SBHE BUDGETARY GUIDELINE LEVELS IF WARRANTED ON THE BASIS OF THE MERITS OF INSTITUTIONAL REQUESTS AND EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE. INSTITUTIONS WHICH ARE ABOVE OR BELOW 100 PERCENT OF THE GUIDELINE LEVEL SHOULD PLAN A TRANSITION TO REACH THE GUIDELINE LEVEL OF SPENDING IN NO MORE THAN FIVE YEARS. NEW PROGRAMS AND SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS, NOT PROVIDED FOR BY GUIDELINES, SHOULD BE JUDGED ON THEIR INDIVIDUAL MERITS.

Status

See Table 47.

TABLE 47

TOTAL FUND SUPPORT IN GUIDELINE PROGRAMS
AS A PERCENT OF SBHE GUIDELINES

	FY 1979 Expenditures	FY 1980 Appropriation	FY 1981 Appropriation
Univ. of Md.			
College Park	97.7%	94.6%	91.0%
Eastern Shore	120.1	122.1	104.2
Baltimore County	118.3	107.3	101.4
Average U. of Md.	101.1%	97.3%	92.9%
St. Univ. and Colleges			
Bowie	105.5%	110.1%	98.6%
Coppin	103.1	98.5	92.8
Frostburg	96.4	100.9	96.3
Salisbury	91.9	92.0	89.9
Towson	92.3	93.4	92.5
Univ. of Baltimore	80.6	83.0	87.4
Average - BTSUC	93.5%	94.9%	92.6%
Morgan	115.7%	104.5%	114.0%
St. Mary's	105.0%	101.9%	91.6%
Average	99.4%	96.7%	94.1%

Assessment

In FY 1979, the four-year public institutions were funded at 99.4 percent of the SBHE guidelines. The total level of funding for the basic operating budgets of the institutions has declined since FY 1979. In FY 1980, the institutions as a group have operated at 96.7 percent of the guidelines and the FY 1981 appropriation will provide for only 94.1 percent of the guideline level of expenditures.

In FY 1979, five institutions (UMCP, Frostburg, Salisbury, the University of Baltimore, and Towson) were below the guidelines. As of FY 1981, only the University of Baltimore was able to make significant progress toward the guideline level of funding (from 80.6 percent to 87.4 percent). Towson and Frostburg have not shown any substantial change while Salisbury has shown a slight loss. Among these institutions, the biggest declines in relation to the guidelines took place at UMCP, which went from 97.7 percent to 91.0 percent of guidelines and at St. Mary's which went from 105.0 percent to 91.6 percent of the guidelines.

In FY 1979, six institutions (UMES, UMBC, Bowie, Coppin, Morgan, St. Mary's) were above the guidelines. Since then, UMES, UMBC and Bowie have decreased their budgets closer to the guidelines. Coppin and St. Mary's have decreased to substantially below the guidelines. Morgan remains about the same amount above the guidelines as in FY 1979.

Action

THE SCHEDULE SET FORTH IN THE ABOVE RECOMMENDATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL BUDGETS TO CONFORM TO GUIDELINE LEVELS SHOULD CONTINUE TO SERVE AS AN OBJECTIVE PENDING THE OUTCOME OF THE SCHEDULED REVIEW OF THE BUDGETARY GUIDELINES.

GENERAL FUND SUPPORT

The Plan contains the following recommendation.

> WITHIN FIVE YEARS, THE STATE SHOULD PROVIDE 70 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL FUNDS NEEDED TO FUND GUIDELINE PROGRAMS AT PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES. THE REMAINING INSTITUTIONAL COSTS SHOULD BE BORNE BY STUDENT TUITION AND

FEES AND BY OTHER INSTITUTIONALLY GENERATED REVENUES. NON-GUIDELINE PROGRAMS SHOULD BE FUNDED BASED ON THEIR INDIVIDUAL MERITS.

Status

See Table 48

Assessment

In FY 1979, the total expenditures in the guideline programs at the public four-year institutions were supported 64.5 percent with General Funds compared with 65.5 percent in FY 1980 and 65.3 percent in FY 1981. In FY 1979, four institutions (UMES, UMBC, Bowie, and St. Mary's) received in excess of 70 percent General Fund support for their educational activities. As of FY 1981 these institutions remained above the 70 percent mark. All other institutions were below the 70 percent level in FY 1979. A number of these made some progress: Coppin, Frostburg, UMCP, Towson, and University of Baltimore. Salisbury remained stable and Morgan declined slightly.

Action

THE OBJECTIVE OF MOVING TOWARD 70 PERCENT STATE SUPPORT OF GUIDELINE PROGRAMS, AS INDICATED IN THE ABOVE RECOMMENDATION, SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE FOLLOWED.

SELF-SUPPORTING INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

The Plan provides for the SBHE to study and develop recommendations concerning State policies for funding summer schools and mini-mesters at public colleges and universities and for funding the University of Maryland University College. Historically, direct State funding has not been provided for these activities except for some overhead costs.

Recommendations

The SBHE has completed a study of self-supporting instructional programs at public colleges and universities. Copies of the report are available upon request. The recommendations in the report were adopted by the SBHE at its May, 1979 meeting.

TABLE 48

GENERAL FUND SUPPORT IN GUIDELINE PROGRAMS
AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL FUNDS
IN GUIDELINE PROGRAMS

	FY 1979 Expenditures	FY 1980 Appropriation	FY 1981 Appropriation
Univ. of Md.			
College Park	61.1%	62.5%	62.0%
Eastern Shore	77.9	74.6	82.5
Baltimore County	77.9	77.5	76.5
Av. - U. of Md.	64.3%	65.2%	65.0%
St. Univ. and Colleges			
Bowie	70.7%	70.6%	71.9%
Coppin	61.0	65.0	67.0
Frostburg	68.7	72.0	72.1
Salisbury	66.4	66.4	66.4
Towson	61.9	63.2	63.3
Univ. of Baltimore	52.0	54.2	53.1
Average - BTSUC	63.1%	64.7%	65.0%
Morgan	69.7%	65.3%	67.3%
St. Mary's	72.7%	75.5%	75.6%
Average	64.5%	65.5%	65.3%

THE STATE BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION RECOMMENDS THAT ALL DIRECT INSTRUCTIONAL AND PUBLIC SERVICE COSTS OF SUMMER SCHOOL, MINI-MESTERS, AND THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE BE SELF-SUPPORTING AT PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS. HOWEVER, SUMMER SCHOOL AND MINI-MESTER PROGRAMS SHOULD NOT BE REQUIRED TO CONTRIBUTE TO COSTS OF THE REGULAR PROGRAMS OF THE INSTITUTIONS WHICH WOULD BE INCURRED IRRESPECTIVE OF THE EXISTENCE OF SUMMER SCHOOLS AND MINI-MESTERS; AND THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE SHOULD NOT BE CHARGED FOR THESE COSTS AT THE CAMPUSES ON WHICH IT OFFERS COURSES.

Status

This recommended policy will require additional General Funds because overhead activities which now are partially funded by self-supporting programs will be supported as part of total State-supported programs. This policy would have required increased General Funds of $1,664,432 in FY 1981 ($1,255,432 for summer schools/mini-mesters and $411,000 for UMUC). However, funds have not been provided to implement this recommendation.

Action

THE SBHE WILL CONTINUE TO SUPPORT REQUESTS FOR FUNDING TO IMPLEMENT THIS RECOMMENDATION.

STATE SUBSIDY OF AUXILIARY ENTERPRISE OPERATIONS

Fiscal year 1981 will be the final year in which the State provides a subsidy to institutions for plant operation and maintenance costs of auxiliary enterprise facilities. The State has decreased its rate of subsidy for these operations by ten percent per year since FY 1972. The Plan contains a recommendation that this schedule continue to be followed because the subsidy provides benefits only to certain categories of students who in terms of equity should pay for these services.

Status

The FY 1981 budget allows for the scheduled phase-out of the auxiliary enterprise subsidy. FY 1981 will be the last year

of the subsidy.

Action

THE SCHEDULE FOR PHASING OUT THE STATE SUBSIDY FOR AUXILIARY ENTERPRISE FACILITIES SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE FOLLOWED AS RECOMMENDED IN THE PLAN.

FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SALARIES

The Plan contains a recommendation that faculty and administrative salary levels at all public colleges and universities be competitive with those at comparable institutions. Specifically recommended was additional funding for faculty salaries in FY 1980 for UMCP (which SBHE analysis had identified as being particularly low in comparison to similar campuses) to permit it to bring salaries closer to competitive levels.

Status

The SBHE supported $1.4M in the FY 1980 budget request for UMCP faculty salary increases over and above Statewide across-the-board increases. The 1979 Maryland General Assembly appropriated $1,000,000 for the entire University for retention and recruitment of outstanding faculty. In FY 1981, the SBHE supported $1.15 million for recruitment and retention for outstanding faculty at the University of Maryland. The Legislature appropriated $0.5 million to be used entirely for recruitment of outstanding faculty. The faculty salaries at the University of Maryland still remain substantially below the average salaries paid by comparable institutions. Meanwhile, the faculty salaries at the State Universities and Colleges have remained at about the 75th percentile of the AAUP category IIA institutions.

The salaries of executives and senior administrators at the higher educations institutions and agencies are about 11 percent below the average paid by comparable institutions and agencies throughout the country (see Chapter II).

Action

THE SBHE HAS COMPLETED A STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE SALARIES AND MADE PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GUIDELINES. DETAILS OF

THIS STUDY ARE PROVIDED IN CHAPTER 2. FACULTY SALARY GUIDELINES WILL BE RECOMMENDED BY THE SBHE DURING FY 1981.

BUDGET ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

The Plan recommends the SBHE budgetary guidelines be utilized to examine budgetary requests from public colleges and universities. This approach, which concentrates on total program costs and analysis of the costs of comparable programs among institutions, is recommended because of its focus on broad issues and equity in the distribution of funds. The Plan further recommends that the SBHE, the segments, the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning, and the Department of Fiscal Services agree on guidelines to be used each year.

The introduction to this Chapter summarizes the process by which the guidelines will be revised.

LEVEL OF DETAIL IN BUDGETS

The Plan contains the recommendation that the SBHE initiate discussions with the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning and the Legislature to determine the feasibility of developing budget formats which require less detailed expenditure requests. This would reduce the burden of budget preparation as well as provide institutions with more flexibility to expend funds within specific budget programs.

Status

The SBHE has initiated discussions with the DBFP on budget formats. Certain changes have been made and for the first time the DBFP and SBHE sent out a joint set of instructions for FY 1982 budget submissions.

Action

THE SBHE WILL CONTINUE TO WORK WITH THE INSTITUTIONS/SEGMENTS/ AGENCIES, THE DBFP AND THE DFS TO ESTABLISH A BUDGET FORMAT WHICH INCLUDES THE INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR ANALYSIS AND PLACES THE MINIMUM BURDEN ON THOSE PREPARING THE INFORMATION.

POST AUDITS AND EVALUATION

The Plan provides that the SBHE develop a process for evaluating the overall effectiveness of institutional operations. This provision is consistent with SBHE's statutory responsibility to "....investigate and evaluate, in consultation with the agencies and institutions concerned with postsecondary education in the State, their present and future capability to meet State needs for postsecondary training and research." Major purposes of the evaluation process are to help ensure quality and efficiency, to provide a better basis for policy and budgetary decisions, and to lessen the need for pre-audits and related budgetary controls.

Status and Action

The Board began implementation of its institutional evaluation process with visits to seven community colleges due for regional accreditation in Spring 1980. The evaluation visits were trial runs of the process outlined below, and modifications in the process will be made based on this experience.

The process has three major elements. First, SBHE coordinates with the Middle States Association of Schools and Colleges (MSA) evaluation team visits to each public college and university on a five-year cycle. There are two teams on these visits - a team chosen by and reporting to the regional accrediting association, and a team chosen by and reporting to SBHE. The responsibilities of the two teams are stated in an agreement between MSA and the State Board for Higher Education. The SBHE team members' reports deal primarily, but not necessarily exclusively, with the general administration of the institution, with the financial and management aspects of the institution, and with physical plant maintenance. The MSA team members' reports focus directly on the educational quality of the institution, paying particular attention to outcomes and the extent to which the institution's resources enable it to sustain and/or improve the quality of its program.

A second major element is an Institutional Profile and Analysis prepared by the SBHE staff as background material for the SBHE evaluation team. This document is based on quantitative data, audit reports, and other information available to the Board concerning conditions and trends at the institution to be evaluated. This analysis is compatible with and has benefited from the evaluation system developed by the SBCC. Data is examined for trends and for comparability with similar institutions.

The third element of the process is the final report on the institution prepared by the SBHE staff for action by the Board. This document is composed of two sections: (a) the consultants' reports, and (b) a SBHE staff report based primarily on the consultants' reports but utilizing other information available to the staff. The staff report also contains recommendations for action by the Board, including a recommendation on the continued State approval of the institution to operate.

A draft of a policy manual which establishes the formal aspects of the instutitional evaluation process has been circulated to the segments for review and comment. After these comments are received, a second draft of the policy manual will be prepared for adoption by the Board.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The Plan contains a recommendation that SBHE, in cooperation with the Maryland Higher Education Loan Corporation, the State Scholarship Board, and the segments ensure that demographic data are collected for students receiving financial aid in order to evaluate existing student aid programs.

Status

At the request of the 1980 Maryland General Assembly, the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning is currently reviewing the programs of both agencies. Further action on this recommendation will depend on the outcome of this study.

FEDERAL STUDENT AID DISTRIBUTED BY FORMULA

The Plan provides that the SBHE monitor the amounts of federal student financial aid received by Maryland through programs that are federally funded.

Status

The SBHE continues to review financial aid distributions to Maryland to ensure tnat the correct information is used in applying formulas. The SBHE will bring any discrepancies to the attention of the appropriate federal agencies if and when they arice.

BEOG AWARDS

The Plan recommends that applicants for General State Scholarships and Other Race Grants also be required to file a BEOG application.

Status

This recommendation has not been implemented. The study underway by the Department of Budget should be completed before any further assessment of this recommendation is made.

EDUCATION INFORMATION CENTERS

The Plan provides for SBHE to implement the provisions of Title IV of the Higher Education Act for establishment of Education Information Centers (EIC's). This effort is designed to improve the quality and coordination of information available to students concerning all aspects of postsecondary education.

Status

The SBHE, as the State's administrative agency for the Federally funded Education Information Centers program, in 1979 received its second annual award of $50,000 from the U. S. Office of Education.

In 1979 SBHE pursued development of a statewide computerized information service to provide current, accurate and individualized information to the general public. The SBHE initially planned to expand the computerized system developed by Towson State University named "Explore" and make it available to other agencies and institutions throughout Maryland on a contractual basis, using EIC funds as seed money.

However, in December, 1979 the SBHE postponed its intended agreement with Towson in order to first reach an agreement on cooperation with a separate Federally funded project just beginning in Maryland called the Career Information Delivery System (CIDS) project. This project was initiated by the State Occupation Information Coordinating Committee (SOICC) of Maryland, jointly sponsored by the State Department of Education and the State Department of Human Resources. The CIDS project will provide users with information on specific career or educational opportunities based on individual interests.

After several months of assessment and negotiation, SBHE decided to transfer its EIC grant funds to the SOICC to be used to supplement the CIDS project. This decision resulted from the conviction that only one educational and occupational computer information delivery system should be sponsored by the State and SBHE's agreement that SOICC take the lead in developing such a system.

Action

SBHE WILL CONTINUE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE CIDS PROJECT THROUGH REPRESENTATION ON SEVERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES ESTABLISHED BY THE SOICC. SHOULD FUNDS CONTINUE TO BE MADE AVAILABLE FOR THIS PROGRAM, THE SBHE WILL EVALUATE THE NEED TO PROVIDE FURTHER SUPPORT FOR THE CIDS PROJECT AND WHETHER TO PURSUE ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES FOR DISSEMINATING EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC. SUCH STRATEGIES COULD INCLUDE TELEPHONE COUNSELING AND REFERRAL SERVICES, PUBLICATION OF VARIOUS DIRECTORIES, A CENTRAL RESOURCE CLEARINGHOUSE AND SIMILAR VENTURES.

GRANTS FOR IMPROVING PROGRAM EFFICIENCY

The Plan provides that the SBHE implement a program of providing grants to institutions for improving the efficiency of their programs.

Status

The SBHE received $50,000 in FY 1979 and again in FY 1980 to implement this program. Seven grants were made in FY 1980:

Institution/ Agency	Purpose	Amount
Univ. of Md., Central Admin.	Admin. Consolidation of Academic Support Services	$ 8,000
Garrett Com. College	Computerization of Student Data	3,701
Reg. Educ. Service Agency of Appalachian Maryland	Assessment Model for Monitoring Postsecondary Participation	15,000
Univ. of Maryland	Admin. of a U.S. Gov't Depository Library in	9,035

	an Academic Library	
Cecil Com. College	Mgmt and Leadership Skills Develop. Pgrm for use of a computer. mgmt info. system	4,600
Frostburg St. Coll.	Info. and Evaluation System for Effecting the Academic Master Plan	4,664
Univ. of Md., Center for Environ. and Estuarine Studies	Admin. Centralization of Financial Acctng System	5,000
	TOTAL	$50,000

The Governor's Budget Request for FY 1981 did not contain funds for continuing this program.

Assessment

Budgetary constraints appear appear likely to restrict institutional ability to provide "start up" costs for assessing and implementing management improvements. Although the $100,000 provided for grants to increase program efficiency in FY 1979 and 1980 has contributed to some important improvements, the SBHE has been somewhat disappointed in the quality and significance of many of the proposed projects. Consequently, during 1980 an evaluation will be made of the results and promise of the first two years' projects. Based on this evaluation, an assessment will be made of ways which best encourage improvements in efficiency. Plans then will be developed to undertake indicated actions.

Action

THE SBHE WILL ASSESS ACCOMPLISHMENTS RESULTING FROM GRANTS MADE DURING FY 1979 AND FY 1980. BASED ON THIS ASSESSMENT, ACTIONS NEEDED TO BETTER ACCOMPLISH THE GOALS OF THE EFFICIENCY GRANT PROGRAM WILL BE RECOMMENDED, TOGETHER WITH ANY BUDGET REQUESTS NEEDED FOR IMPLEMENTATION.

VII. Facilities

Major facilities recommendations in the Plan concern improving facilities currently in existence and improving planning for facilities. These emphases are appropriate for an era of stable or declining enrollments and increasing fiscal constraints. In furthering this emphasis, the SBHE will conduct an obsolescence study during FY 1981 and FY 1982 on the facilities at the public four-year institutions to determine the need for comprehensive alteration and renovation.

Many existing campus facilities are in a state of substantial deterioration. It is extremely important that the State be fully appraised of the extent of this deterioration in terms of the identification of these facilities and the development of cost estimates for alterations, renovations, or razing of these facilities.

PRIORITIES FOR FUNDING FACILITIES

The Update to the Plan established categories of projects and the priority these categories would receive in SBHE's review of FY 1981 capital budget requests. These are in priority order: (1) Projects immediately required to protect life or avoid major property deterioration; (2) Completion of and equipping of projects which have already been funded; (3) Energy conservation; (4) Improvement of handicapped accessibility; (5) Renovation and Alteration of existing facilities; (6) Utilities improvements; (7) Site improvements; (8) Expansion of existing facilities; (9) Construction of new facilities; and (10) Real property acquisition.

Status

These priorities as well as other criteria were used by SBHE in the review of the FY 1981 Capital budgets.

Assessment

For the FY 1982 Capital Budget review, only one change in the priorities will be made. Renovation and Alteration of existing facilities should be the fourth priority and Handicapped Accessibility the fifth priority. These changes are warranted because the most serious handicapped accessibility problems have been funded in FY 1981, and the need for the renovation and alteration of existing facilities to make them more efficient for their required purposes is vital.

Action

THE SBHE WILL UTILIZE THE FOLLOWING SET OF PRIORITY CATEGORIES, IN ADDITION TO THE MERITS OF INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS, IN REVIEWING FY 1982 CAPITAL PROJECT REQUESTS: (1) PROJECTS IMMEDIATELY REQUIRED TO PROTECT LIFE OR AVOID MAJOR PROPERTY DETERIORATION; (2) COMPLETION OF AND EQUIPPING OF PROJECTS WHICH HAVE ALREADY BEEN FUNDED; (3) ENERGY CONSERVATION; (4) RENOVATION AND ALTERATION OF EXISTING FACILITIES; (5) IMPROVEMENT OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBILITY; (6) UTILITIES IMPROVEMENTS; (7) SITE IMPROVEMENTS; (8) EXPANSION OF EXISTING FACILITIES; (9) CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FACILITIES; AND (10) REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION.

ELIMINATION OF DEFERRED MAINTENANCE PROJECTS

The Plan provides that each public segment submit to SBHE by March 1, 1979 a plan for the elimination of deferred maintenance projects. The Update to the Plan provides that each public segment submit five-year plans for eliminating the remaining deferred maintenance projects as part of their annual plans beginning in 1980.

Status

Each of the public four-year institutions has submitted a list of its deferred maintenance projects through FY 1986 as a part of its FY 1982 Plan/MARC submission. The State Board for Community Colleges also has conducted an evaluation of deferred maintenance items at community college campuses.

Assessment

The State began providing General Fund support for deferred maintenance projects in FY 1979. The requests for deferred maintenance projects have far exceeded the appropriations in both FY 1979 and FY 1980; thus, it appears that unless the level of funding for deferred maintenance is increased substantially, deferred maintenance projects will not be eliminated until at least FY 1986. The table below displays the appropriations for this purpose by institution for FY 1979 through FY 1981.

	FY 1979 Actual	FY 1980 Approp.	FY 1981 Approp
Univ. of Maryland			
Baltimore City	$ 417,562	$ 0	$ 841,300
Baltimore County	120,670	0	0
College Park	2,291,830	1,167,200	1,662,000
Eastern Shore	56,027	0	80,000
Cent. Environmental and Estuarian Studies	190,056	27,320	35,000
Agri. Experiment Sta.	38,654	127,111	88,457
Subtotal - UM	$3,114,799	$1,321,631	$2,706,757
BTSUC			
Bowie	$ 112,979	$ 84,000	$ 15,000
Coppin	57,639	0	31,200
Frostburg	386,409	86,000	63,000
Salisbury	212,416	35,000	47,000
Towson	372,595	105,000	115,000
Univ. of Baltimore	267,012	0	33,000
Subtotal - BTSUC	$1,409,050	$ 310,000	$ 304,200
Morgan	$ 0	$ 159,500	$ 146,465
St. Mary's	0	107,100	125,000
TOTAL	$4,523,849	$1,898,231	$3,282,422

Action

THE PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS SHOULD CONTINUE TO REQUEST FUNDING TO ELIMINATE ALL DEFERRED MAINTENANCE PROJECTS ON THEIR CAMPUSES.

Preventive Maintenance Plans

The Plan contains a recommendation that public institutions and segments submit five-year preventive maintenance plans. The Update to the Plan revised this recommendation and stated that instead of requiring submission of five-year plans, the SBHE will review the annual submissions by public institutions and segments to the Department of General Services to determine the adequacy of their preventive maintenance programs. Based on this review, SBHE will suggest any needed revisions.

Status

The first set of institutional evaluations of preventive maintenance plans has been received by DGS and a copy has been sent by DGS to SBHE. The SBHE is currently reviewing the evaluations.

Action

THE PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS SHOULD SEND COPIES OF THE EVALUATIONS OF THEIR PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE PROGRAMS REQUIRED BY DGS TO THE SBHE. THE SBHE WILL REVIEW THE EVALUATIONS AND INCORPORATE RECOMMENDATIONS INTO THEIR BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS.

CONSTRUCTION OF DORMITORIES

This issue is being dealt with through a study currently underway. Details of this study are provided in Chapter 2 of this report.

HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBILITY

The Plan provides that the SBHE request from public institutions and segments, as part of their FY 1980 Capital budget requests, projects required to implement the provisions of the Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973 concerning accessibility for the handicapped. Federal law requires that all programs be accessible to the handicapped by June, 1980.

Status

Institutions submitted handicapped accessibility projects as part of their FY 1980 and FY 1981 Capital budget requests. These projects constituted Phase I of complying with the Federal legislation. Most institutions have been appropriated the funding required to comply with the Federal law. Not all of the projects will be completed by the Federal deadline. A few institutions will have additional handicapped accessibility requests in their FY 1982 Capital Budget submissions. The older campuses have had the greatest difficulty in complying with these guidelines as most of their facilities were constructed before architects took into account the needs of the handicapped in their designs. More than $5.0 million will be expended for facilities modifications by FY 1982. Funds for facilities modifications have been included in both operating and capital budgets and are detailed below.

Univ. of Md.	FY 1979 Actual	FY 1980 Approp.	FY 1981 Approp.	Total
Baltimore City	$ 10,000	$ 700,000	$ 405,000	$1,115,000
Baltimore County	14,800	94,200	80,000	189,000
College Park	88,860	1,050,000	690,000	1,828,860
Eastern Shore	0	270,000	100,000	370,000
Subtotal - UM	$113,660	$2,114,200	$1,275,000	$3,502,860
St. Univ. and Colleges				
Bowie	$ 0	$ 65,000	$ 0	$ 65,000
Coppin	0	58,000	0	58,000
Frostburg	0	350,000	0	350,000
Salisbury	0	125,000	0	125,000
Towson	0	370,000	0	370,000
Univ. of Balto.	0	16,000	0	16,000
Subtotal - BTSUC	$ 0	$ 984,000	$ 0	$ 984,000
Morgan	$ 0	$ 200,000	$ 0	$ 200,000
St. Mary's	0	400,000	0	400,000
TOTAL	$113,660	$3,698,200	$1,275,000	$5,086,860

Action

ALL PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS WILL SUBMIT DOCUMENTATION TO THE SBHE TO INDICATE EFFORTS IN IMPLEMENTING PROGRAM ACCESSIBILITY FOR THE HANDICAPPED. THE DOCUMENTATION SHOULD INCLUDE THE AMOUNT SPENT ON THIS EFFORT AND THE SOURCE OF FUNDS.

CAMPUS CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS

The Plan provides that campus development plans be submitted to the SBHE as part of annual capital budget requests by public institutions and segments. The Update to the Plan provides that public institutions which are not currently involved in the process of planning for, or writing, new plans will not be required to submit updated campus development plans until a Statewide Facilities Inventory is completed and Space Guidelines revised. Public institutions which have nearly completed (more than 75% complete) plans are encouraged to continue developing them and provide updates once the statewide space inventory and space guidelines are revised.

Status

Only two institutions, UMAB and UMES, have submitted campus development plans. Review of these plans by the SBHE will not occur until completion of the Space Guidelines. The Statewide Facilities Inventory and Revision of the Space Guidelines are scheduled to be completed by December, 1980.

Assessment

There is a continuing need for completed and up-to-date plans for capital budget review. Standardized and complete inventories of campus facilities will be available and detailed guidelines will be developed in 1980 for determining space needs.

Action

IN 1981, THE PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS SHOULD SUBMIT UPDATED CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT PLANS TO THE SBHE AND THE DSP. PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS WHICH HAVE RECENTLY COMPLETED CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT PLANS SHOULD PROVIDE UPDATES CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE SPACE INVENTORY AND THE REVISED SPACE GUIDELINES.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

The Plan recommends two energy conservation measures: (1) that capital project requests for buildings include a life cycle cost and energy consumption analysis and (2) that public institutions of higher education participate in the Federal energy audit and construction programs of the National Energy Act.

Status

The Department of General Services has developed guidelines for carrying out life cycle cost and energy consumption analyses. These will be incorporated in all capital facilities (building) projects as required by DGS.

The Education Coordinating Committee has been designated as the group responsible for implementing provisions of the National Energy Act for education in Maryland. The SBHE and the State Department of Education participated in the development of the State's application for federal funding to perform preliminary energy audits and energy audits as required by the Act.

Assessment

Following promulgation of Federal guidelines, the SBHE and the State Department of Education (SDE) participated in developing a proposal for Federal funding of technical assistance to and energy conservation measures for institutions undertaking such projects. In addition, the SBHE and the SDE

have provided assistance to all educational institutions which participate in this Act. The SBHE and the SDE will continue to provide assistance for the remainder of the Federal program.

Action

ALL PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS WILL SUBMIT A REPORT ANNUALLY TO THE SBHE ON REDUCTIONS IN ENERGY CONSUMPTION. CAPITAL PROGRAM STATEMENTS BEGINNING IN FY 1981 WILL BE REQUIRED TO CONTAIN DIRECTIONS TO THE A/E DESIGN TEAM TO INCLUDE LIFE CYCLE COSTS AND ENERGY CONSUMPTION ANALYSES DURING THE DESIGN PHASE.

STATEWIDE FACILITIES INVENTORY

The Update to the Plan provides that the SBHE, in cooperation with the Department of State Planning and Segments, develop an automated facilities inventory system for all institutions of higher education by July 1, 1980.

Status

The inventory forms were sent to all of the public institutions in April, 1980 with a due date of July 1, 1980. When the forms are received the data will be entered on the computer by the SBHE.

Action

THE SBHE WILL PROVIDE A REPORT SPECIFYING THE AMOUNT OF SPACE BY TYPE DURING FY 1981. EACH INSTITUTION SHOULD PROVIDE AN UPDATE OF ITS INVENTORY ANNUALLY BY JUNE 1 OF EACH YEAR.

Review of Facility Space Requirement Guidelines

The Update to the Plan provides that a review of the Space Guidelines for public four-year institutions be undertaken when the facilities inventory is completed.

Status

The Department of State Planning has hired a consulting firm to assist in the revision of space guidelines for public four-year higher education institutions. The firm is working with an advisory group composed of representatives from DSP, DBFP, SBHE, the University of Maryland and the State Universities and Colleges. The guidelines should be completed by December, 1980.

Action

THE SBHE WILL REVIEW AND ANALYZE THE GUIDELINES IN TERMS OF THE CURRENT FACILITIES ON EACH CAMPUS. THE SBHE SHOULD ADOPT THE GUIDELINES PRIOR TO THE FY 1983 CAPITAL BUDGET SUBMISSIONS.

VIII. Faculty, Libraries, and Computer Services

FACULTY

The Plan recommends that the SBHE, in cooperation with the segments, analyze the age, rank, and tenure status of the faculty. This analysis was recommended in light of the need for sound planning during a period of stable or declining enrollments and the need for institutions to maintain enough flexibility to respond to changing conditions.

Status

The statewide data base has not existed to carry out the analysis called for in the recommendation. The faculty data collected by SBHE are not in a format that permits study of rates of rank and tenure achievement by variables such as age and program. Therefore, in order to collect the data on a continuing basis with a minimum of burden on the segments and with maximum usefulness, it was decided to begin collecting faculty data on computer tape instead of on paper forms. This data collection system will be implemented on a pilot basis in fall, 1980. Beginning with the fall 1981 data collection cycle, analysis required by the Plan can begin to be carried out.

Faculty Development

In addition to the need for specific data for use in projecting and planning for the future composition of institutional faculty, there is a continuing need to plan for faculty development. Faculty development programs are essential if faculty are to remain abreast of changing conditions in their fields through interaction with their colleagues throughout the country. Because of the prospects of reduced faculty mobility among institutions and limited openings for newly-trained young faculty, mechanisms for providing current faculty with opportunities for exposure to new developments in their fields are particularly important at this time. Providing for faculty development within existing institutional budgets is becoming increasingly difficult because of high rates of inflation and funding constraints. Therefore, new approaches for providing support need exploration.

Action

THE SBHE, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND THE SEGMENTS, WILL DEVELOP BY JANUARY, 1981 PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING FACULTY DEVELOPMENT. FUNDS FOR SUCH PROPOSALS WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE SBHE'S FY 1983 PRE-MARC RECOMMENDATION.

LIBRARIES

The Plan outlines four areas for library planning activities: (1) data collection, (2) development of standards for evaluating the adequacy of academic libraries, (3) planning for library development, and (4) planning for library automation.

The SBHE employed an academic library specialist in the fall of 1979. Since that time, work has begun in each of the areas indicated above as well as in other areas such as analysis of future library space requirements at UMCP and revision of the SBHE budgetary guidelines for libraries.

In order to proceed further in the areas outlined in the Statewide Plan, a closer continuing working relationship between the libraries, institutions, segments and the SBHE staff is desirable. Therefore, a permanent committee of appropriate representatives will be formed to advise the SBHE staff in all the areas outlined in the plan as well as on other issues related to libraries.

Data Collection

The Plan provides for the SBHE to develop uniform definitions for the collection of data necessary to evaluate the adequacy and effectiveness of library planning and coordination.

Status

Currently data on libraries are regularly collected through (1) annual budget submissions of public four-year colleges and universities and (2) the federal government's HEGIS collection from the institutions (every other year - odd years). In the past, the data elements and definitions used in these collections were not entirely comparable. During this past year, the SBHE staff prepared a revised data collection instrument for use in budgets submitted during fall 1980 (no HEGIS collection for libraries takes place in Fall 1980). The Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning incorporated this instrument in its budget instructions. This instrument utilizes

data elements and definitions which are compatible with those used in HEGIS. Experience gained with the budget submissions using the revised instrument will provide an indication of the utility of the data for both budget review and planning purposes.

The SBHE staff, in cooperation with the Library Advisory Committee will review the data submitted by public institutions in their Fall 1980 budget requests and develop a single instrument which can be used by all institutions for providing necessary information annually to the State and federal governments.

Library Standards

The Plan provides for the SBHE to examine the need for improved standards for evaluating the adequacy of Maryland academic libraries.

Status

A variety of standards currently exist nationwide for evaluating library adequacy. The most commonly used set of standards are those of the American Library Association. It is desirable to conduct an in-depth review of these and other standards and develop a set which can be used to evaluate the adequacy of Maryland academic libraries.

During the past year, the SBHE staff carried out a review of library standards used throughout the country. The SBHE, in cooperation with the Library Advisory Group will review standards currently in use and their applicability to public academic libraries in Maryland. A set of standards will be proposed to the Board for adoption by July 1981.

Planning for Library Development

The Plan provides for the SBHE to develop the capability to coordinate and plan the development of academic libraries in cooperation with the Division of Library Development and Services (DLDS) of the State Department of Education.

Status

During the past year the SBHE staff and representatives of public and independent libraries participated in the planning process for the update of the DLDS five-year plan. Work is still underway on this plan. The Library Advisory Group will provide a more formal mechanism for coordinating activities with DLDS and for dealing with issues of interest to higher education.

Planning for Library Automation

The State Plan provides for the SBHE to examine the status and possibilities for library automation and networking.

Status

The major activity undertaken in this area during the past year was providing for the delivery of computerized library service to Maryland academic libraries as the Maryland Academic Library Center for Automated Processing (MALCAP) at UMCP went out of existence.

MALCAP was an unincorporated and informal organization which provided bibliographic services to Maryland libraries from 1972 to 1980. Its governance structure consisted of the UMCP Director of Libraries as an Appointing Authority and a Board designated by the Appointed Authority for indefinite term. Throughout its history MALCAP has depended on resources provided by member libraries and substantial contributions of staff and facilities by the UMCP Libraries. Originally, MALCAP existed solely as a means for extending to other libraries a UMCP capability for duplicating and printing catalog cards from machine readable library records distributed by the Library of Congress. More recently MALCAP began to manage contracts for member libraries to allow them through the Capitol Consortium Network (CAPCON) in Washington, D.C. to access the on-line computerized library services of OCLC, Inc.

OCLC, a large not-for-profit enterprise which is based in Ohio, operates and develops computerized systems for library uses and serves a network of several thousand terminals in libraries throughout the United States and elsewhere. OCLC does not generally contract directly with individual libraries, but rather relies on networks such as CAPCON to manage contracts for it with individual schools as well as to provide training and other support services to contracting institutions.

Among OCLC current services are a record of the holdings of participating libraries available through terminal inquiry and a terminal capability for identifying and adapting machine readable catalog records of the Library of Congress and other OCLC participants for the production of catalog cards. Such services significantly decrease the labor costs associated with the cataloging function carried out at all libraries. Computerized support of other library functions such as acquisition is currently being developed by OCLC.

As MALCAP began preparing to terminate its services, planning began to provide for continuity in obtaining services from OCLC. In February, 1980 the SBHE staff drafted and circulated to MALCAP for its review and comment a plan for a Maryland Bibliographic Center, based on the recommendations of an SBHE consultant and the deliberations of the Maryland Library Network Planning Committee appointed by the Assistant State Superintendant for Libraries of the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE). The plan described an SBHE administered Center which could serve as an interim legal and fiscal agent for Maryland libraries to acquire and utilize OCLC services. In two successive Board meetings (March 5 and April 10) MALCAP endorsed this plan unanimously. The plan for the Center also received endorsement by the SBHE Finance and Facilities Committee in February. Based on these favorable reviews of the plan, the Commissioner for Higher Education solicited letters of intent from each of the segments in public higher education and each of the presidents of the independent institutions. Ten institutions replied in support of the Center. At its April meeting the SBHE supported the concept of the Center. However, the Board directed staff to investigate other alternatives. In response, the SBHE staff developed three major alternatives for delivering OCLC network services to Maryland libraries. The alternatives were:

* An SBHE administered Center serving for a maximum of two years as a legal and fiscal agent for Maryland libraries using OCLC services until a more permanent library networking solution could be developed and implemented.

* An SBHE administered Center serving for a maximum of two years as a legal and fiscal agent for Maryland libraries using OCLC services through group purchase of service from CAPCON until a more permanent library networking solution could be developed and implemented.

* Direct contract for OCLC networking services between institutions and either CAPCON or PALINET (a Philadelphia-based networking organization).

SBHE staff analysis of these alternatives and the institutional preferences resulted in a staff recommendation that all institutions contract directly with PALINET. This

alternative was the most frequently ranked choice of institutions and the most heavily favored choice when choices were weighted to reflect order of preference. For this and a number of additional reasons the Commissioner recommended that all institutions consider the PALINET alternative. First, direct contracting with PALINET also provided lowest cost for Maryland libraries as a group based on bids submitted by both PALINET and CAPCON. Second, PALINET could accommodate most if not all Maryland libraries. Third, existing PALINET members in Maryland expressed satisfaction with its services. Fourth, PALINET has a large membership base and a formal governance structure which provides a voice in directing network activities for libraries which use its services. Fifth, PALINET enjoys a good relationship with several groups of individual members within PALINET which pursue separate cooperative programs. This type of arrangement appears to foster the type of state-based cooperative activity desired by Maryland libraries. Finally, PALINET coordinates its network activities closely with PRLC, another OCLC network organization based in Pittsburgh with which the library of Frostburg State College is affiliated.

After the process was complete, CAPCON proposed a revised and somewhat more favorable set of terms to some of the Maryland libraries which currently use its services through MALCAP. These new terms did not alter the SBHE recommendation since CAPCON did not propose to serve all Maryland libraries and since a number of institutions already had committed themselves to the PALINET alternative. Table 49 shows institutional affiliations during the transition period of FY 1981.

Assessment

Maryland libraries have taken significant steps toward improving computerized network services this year. During FY 1980 two libraries that had not previously used computerized services began using OCLC services. Five or more additional libraries plan to begin OCLC service in FY 1981. PALINET has modified its policy concerning membership by Maryland libraries resulting in substantial cost savings over FY 1980 charges for the majority of Maryland libraries which have elected to seek membership. CAPCON has reduced its charges to Maryland users who elected not to join PALINET for the next fiscal year. A major goal remains to facilitate further cooperation among academic libraries through better use of computerized network library services.

COMPUTER SERVICES

TABLE 49

INSTITUTIONAL LIBRARY NETWORK AFFILIATIONS

Institution/Library	Network Use July 1980
Bowie State College	C
Columbia Union College	C
Coppin State College	C
Enoch Pratt Free Library	P
Essex Community College	P
Frostburg State College	PRLC
Harford Community College	P
Hood College	P
Johns Hopkins University	P
Loyola/Notre Dame Library	C
Morgan State University	C
Mount St. Mary's College	P
St. Mary's College	P
Salisbury State College	*
Towson State University	C
University of Baltimore	C
UM Baltimore Health Sciences	P
UM Baltimore Law	P
University of Maryland Baltimore County	P
University of Maryland College Park	P
University of Maryland Eastern Shore	P

P - PALINET Pennsylvania Area Library and Information Network
C - CAPCON Capitol Consortium of Universities
PRLC - Pittsburgh Regional Library Center

* Salisbury plans to utilize PALINET in FY 1981 or sooner

The State Plan provided for SBHE to participate in a study of data processing requirements of public institutions being carried out by the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning. That study recommended that the SBHE develop planning guidelines as well as a plan for computing at public four-year institutions. The First Annual Review of the Statewide Plan provided for the SBHE to requst the resources to develop the recommended plan and guidelines.

Status

The SBHE requested, but did not receive, funding for development of a plan and guidelines for computing. Because the SBHE does not have the resources to carry out this recommendation, no progress has been made in development of guidelines or a Plan. Instead, the SBHE staff has participated through the budget process in developing segmental plans for hardware and software acqusition. The major interest of the staff in this process has been in ensuring compatibility of systems. SBHE will continue to remain involved through this process and through review of institutional budget submission.

8 26 80 P40352